

¹In the year 539 A.D. Na'ir Khān son of Ālam Khān the ruler of Asir raided a part of the territories of the Dakini kingdom. The

²Farīd al-Dīn does not mention this invasion of 539 A.D. Na'ir Khān who it will be remembered was Sultān Al-ud-dīn's father-in-law. But, on account of what is said here he says that in 541 A.D. Zainat al-Jahān the title Malka al-Jahān Sultān Al-ud-dīn's queen and the daughter of Na'ir Khān sent a letter to the latter that the Sultān was altogether recollected to himself and was paying all attention to the daughter of the Rājā of Berār (which Col Briggs has not been identified) whom Dilwar Khān had after defeating her father brought with him and had presented to the Sultān who was charmed by her beauty and her great knowledge of music and had given her the name of Zibā Chahra (Col Briggs calls her Zibā Chahra) (having the face of a fair). On receiving this letter Nasir Khān planned the conquest of Berār. The Sultān of Gujrat promised to support him. Na'ir Khān also made secret overtures to the son of Berār and this son promised to join him as he was a descendant of Amir Farrūq and this would become clear and clear if he died fighting on his side and he marched into Berār with his own army and that was the Rājā of Gondwāra. The Berār amir wanted to take Khān Jahān the governor of Berār prisoner and to take him to Na'ir Khān but he shut himself up in the fort of Tarnāla (Col Briggs calls it Narnāl) and sent a report to Sultān Al-ud-dīn. The latter held a council of war when the *amirs* suggested that the Sultān should march in person against Na'ir Khān as the latter would be joined by the probable allies the Sultāns of Cuyrat and Malwa as well as the Rājā of Gondwāra. The Sultān suspecting treachery on the part of his advisers appointed Khalf Hasan Malik ut-tajjar to the command of the army. The latter accepted the appointment but pointed out that his defeat at Mahāmāsā was due to the treachery of the Dakini and Hahidāsis who were envious of the foreigners like himself. He hoped to be successful if the Sultān placed under him only foreigners (Mughals) without any Dakinis or Hahidāsis. The Sultān complied with his prayer and he marched to Daulatābād where he deputised the Dakini and Abyssinian *amirs* to guard the frontier of Gujrat and Malwa. Then with seven thousand Arab horsemen he marched into Berār. At this time Khān Jahān came out of Tarnāla and joined him. Khalf Hasan sent him to Lālingpur to prevent the Rājā of Gondwāra to enter Berār by that route and himself marched to Rohankelra where Nasir Khān was encamped. At the foot of the ghāt he was met by a body of Khōndel troops whom he routed with great slaughter. Nasir Khān considering this defeat to be an evil omen retreated with precipitance to Burhānpūr. Khalf Hasan after recovering possession of the neighbouring country pursued Nasir Khān to Burhānpūr. The latter was unable to meet him and shut himself up in the fort of Lāling (Col Briggs says in a note that Lāling is a small and now insignificant fort but Nasir Khān apparently considered it his safest retreat.)

BIBLIOTHECA INDICA

Work No 225

THE TABAQĀT I AKBARĪ

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

THE TABAQĀT-I-AKBARĪ

OR

KHWĀJAH NIZĀMUDDĪN AHMAD

(A HISTORY OF INDIA FROM THE EARLY MUSALMĀN
INVASIONS TO THE THIRTY EIGHTH YEAR OF
THE REIGN OF AKBAR)

VOLUME III

(8392)

TRANSLATED AND ANNOTATED BY

BRAJENDRANATH DE MA ICS (RETIRED)

AND

REVISED, EDITED AND COMPLETED WITH PREFACE AND INDEX BY
BAINI PRASHAD, DSc FRASB FNI FRSE

Printed at the Baptist Mission Press
Published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal

CALCUTTA

1939

PREFACE

In the Monthly General Meeting for August 1864 of the Asiatic Society of Bengal Calcutta Dr W N Lees one of the Vice Presidents of the Society read a memorandum ¹ detailing the progress of Persian historical works in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series and the policy decided on in connection with the publication of such works In discussing the projected publication of the *Muntakhab al Tawarikh* or the *Tarikh i Badaoni* which had been suggested by Mr E B Cowell in 1862 he referred to the *Tarikh i Nizami* or the *Tabaqat i Akbari* as a very important work of reference and added that it is well worth consideration however whether in conjunction with this work we should not publish in lieu thereof a certain portion of the *Tabaqat i Akbari* which Abd al Qadir professes only to have abridged and which all later historians have made good use of the consideration of this suggestion however was deferred to a future meeting In 1868 he wrote ² it is inconceivable to me why so erroneous an estimate seems to have been formed of the *Tabakat i Akbar Shahi* that it has not attracted more attention It is the history which joins on to the *Tarikh i Firoz Shahi* and is admitted by all contemporary and subsequent authors to be the standard history in continuation of those authorities Unquestionably then the thread of the narrative as given by Nizam ud din Ahmad should be taken up where the authors of the *Tarikh i Firoz Shahi* have dropped it giving him the preference to Abd al Qadir of Badaon or any other author however excellent Blochmann ³ in 1869 remarked It is a matter of regret that the printing of the *Tabaqat i Nizam i Bakhshi* was allowed to be deferred Unfortunately nothing further happened till the

¹ *Journ Asiatic Soc Bengal* vol XXIII pp 464-469 (1864)

See Blochmann *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal* vol XXVIII pt 1 pp 115 116 (1869)

² *Journ Roy Asiat Soc (n.s.)* vol III p 453 (1868)

³ Blochmann *op cit* p 115 (1869)

work was taken up by Mr. Brajendranath De in 1911, and the first fascicles of the text and translation of the first volume were issued in 1913. After this date the work remained in abeyance till the author was induced to take it up again in August 1925, and publication of the text and translation of the first volume ending with the fall of the Afghān Kings of Dehli was completed in 1927. The second volume of the text, ending with the 38th year of Akbar's reign and accounts of the *Amīns* of high rank, the *Sharkhs* of Hindūstān, the *Hakīms* and the poets of the reign of Akbar, was issued in 1931, while the printing of the English translation was completed in 1936—some 4 years after the death of Mr. De. The text of the third volume was completed by Shams-ul-'Ulama Khān Bahādur Hidāyat Hosain from an incomplete manuscript prepared by Mr. De in 1935. The work of editing and completing the third volume of the translation was assigned to me in April 1939, it was hoped that I would have the collaboration of Prof. Mahfūz-ul-Haqq in this work, but this has not been possible. The first half of the volume was published in July and the concluding part is now issued.

It is a matter of regret that a historical work of such importance, which the Society hoped in 1864 to publish at an early date, should have been delayed for almost three quarters of a century, but this was due to a variety of causes among which may be mentioned several large works which were being published by the Society, lack of funds and probably also the issue of a lithograph edition of the *Tabaqāt* by the Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, in 1875.

The subject-matter in the following pages of the preface has been arranged under the following heads

- 1 Life of Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad Bakhshī
- 2 *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, its sources and importance
- 3 Life of Mr. Brajendranath De, M A , I C S (retd.),
the editor and translator of the work
- 4 Concluding remarks and acknowledgments

LIFE OF Khwājah NIZĀMUDDĪN AHMAD BAKHSĪ.

The author is variously styled as Mīzā Nizāmu-d-dīn Ahmad, Khwājah Nizāmu-d-dīn Ahmad or Nizāmī (*vide* Lowe's

translation of *Muntakhab ul Tauarikh* vol II p 479 1924) In *Maathir ul Umaru* he is called Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad while by Abu l Fadl¹ Mir Abu Turab² Firishtah and others the appellation of *Balshu* is added after his name

Unfortunately the information about the life of the author is very limited and the two accounts in *Maathir ul Umaru*³ and by Elliot⁴ seem to be based only on casual references in *Tabaqat i Akbari Albarname A'in i Akbari* and *Muntakhab ul lubab* None of the authors give the date or year of the birth of Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad and the information in this connection from contemporary sources is rather conflicting Mrs Beveridge in her translation of *Babur Nama*⁵ states that Nizamuddin Ahmad was not born till 20 years after Babur's death As Babur died on Jumada I 937 A H (December 26 1530 A D) this would mean that the Khwajah was born in 956 or 957 A H (1549 or 1550 A D) According to Al Badaoni (*vide* Lowe *op cit* pp 411 412) Mirza Nizamuddin Ahmad died at the age of forty five in the 38th year of Akbar's reign of a burning fever on the 23rd Safar 1003 A H (7th November 1594 A D) which would mean that he was born some time in 958 A H (1551 A D) According to Shukh Iahdad Faidi Sirhindi the author of *Akbar Nama* (*vide* Dowson in *Elliot's History of India* vol VI p 130 1875) he died at the age of nearly 48 years on the 22nd Safar 1003 A H in the 39th year

¹ *Albarname* text edition vol III p 605 (1886) and Beveridge's translation of vol III p 94 (1912-1939) In these notes various volumes of the *Albarname* and the *A'in i Akbari* are cited as they have been issued in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series It may however be noted that the *A'in* which has been issued in three volumes really formed the third and final volume of *Albarname* (see Blochmann's Preface to the first volume of the *A'in* Phillott's edition p v 1939)

Mir Abu Turab Vali's *History of Gujarat* edited by E Denison Ross p 104 (1909)

³ *Maathir ul Umaru* by Samsamud Dowla Shah Nawaz Khan *Bibliotheca Indica* edition vol I pp 660-664 (1887-1894)

⁴ Elliot's *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India* pp 180-184 (1849) and *Elliot's History of India* vol V pp 178-180 (1873)

⁵ *Babur Nama* vol II p 704 (1921)

of Akbar's reign. Al-Badāonī's statement, in view of the fact that he was a close friend of Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, and was actively associated with him in the compilation of the *Tabaqāt*, appears to be more reliable, and I have little hesitation in accepting it as correct. The year of his birth may, therefore, be taken as 958 A H or 1551 A D.

Unfortunately we have very little information about Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad's ancestry beyond the fact that he was the son of Khwājah Muqīm Harawī (of Herat), who was one of Bābur's officials and about the close of his reign was the *Dīwān-i-buyūtāt*¹. After the death of Bābur, when Gujarāt was conquered by Humāyūn and the province of Ahmadābād was entrusted to Muzā 'Askarī in 1535 A D, Khwājah Muqīm was appointed his *wazīr*. He accompanied Humāyūn to Āgra when the latter fled after his defeat by Sher Khān Sūr at Chausa in Bihār on 26th June, 1539. Khwājah Muqīm also, according to the *Tabaqāt* (De's translation of vol I, p 1) and *Maūlūk-ul-Umarā*, served under Akbar, this is again referred to in the *Tabaqāt* (De's translation of vol II, p 336) where in the account of the twelfth year it is stated "the author's father remained in Āgra, performing government work."

We know very little about the earlier years of life or the education of the young Khwājah, but according to Dowson² he was one of the pupils of 'Mullā Alī Sher', a learned man, and the father of Fardī Sirhindī, the author of *Albar-Nāma*. There can be little doubt, however, that Nizāmuddīn Ahmad was a well-educated and well-read young man who, "according to the instructions of his worthy father"³, occupied himself with the study of historical works, which brightens the intellect of the

¹ According to Mrs Beveridge "a Barrack officer" (*Bābur-Nāma*, vol II, p 703, note 2), but Dowson translates *Dīwān-i-buyūtāt* as the *Dīwān* of the household (*Elliot's History of India*, vol V, p 178, 1873).

² *Elliot's History of India*, vol VI, p 116 (1875).

³ In this connection also see Mrs Beveridge's remarks where she conjectures that Khwājah Muqīm lived long enough "to impress the worth of historical writing on his son" and probably "transmitted his recollections to him" (*vide Bābur-Nāma*, vol II, p 693, 1921).

studious and inspires the intelligent with awe and by the study of the accounts of the travellers in the stages of the journey of existence which is like a progress of the soul rubbed off the rust of his nature ¹ In addition to being a student of history and literature Khwayjah Nizamuddin Ahmad was a patron of poets and apparently himself used to write poetry though except for the few stray verses in the *Tabaqat* no extensive poetical work by the author is known A reference however to Al Bidaoni shows that various poets such as Amani Bāqāi, Hayatī and Sarfī were invited to Gujarāt by the Khwayjah during the seven years of his stay in that province and they flourished under his patronage It was also during this time that he started writing his *Tabaqat* and had as his associate Mir Maṣūm of Bhakkar who was distinguished as a man of learning and historian ² The interest of Khwayjah Nizamuddin Ahmad in historical matters and his skill as a writer is evidenced by the fact that when the Emperor Akbar ordered the preparation ³ of a history of the Kings of Islam in 990 A H (1582 A D) he employed the Khwayjah as one of the seven authors for its compilation According to Elliot (1849 *op cit* p 179) the compiler of the *Sahihul Akhbār* attributes another work on Indian History under the name of *Tarikh-i Irich* to the author of the *Tabakat-i Akbari* but I am not aware that there is any good authority for the statement I have also not been able to find any other reference beyond a reference in the account of Sarup Chandra *Sahihul Akhbār* in *Elliot's History of India* vol VIII p 314 (1877)

¹ *Tabaqat* De's translation of vol I p ix (1911)

Muntakhabu't-tauarikh Haig's translation of vol III (1925)

² See *Ain-i Akbari* translation of Blochmann vol I Phillott's edition p 279 (1939)

³ *Vide Muntakhabu't-tauarikh* Lowe's translation of vol II p 328 (1924) This is the famous *Tarikh-i Alfi* the introduction of which was written by Abu'l Fadl but curiously the Emperor commanded its preparation in 990 A H even though the history was to deal with the events that had happened in the seven zones for the last one thousand years See *Ain-i Akbari* translation of Blochmann vol I revised by Phillott pages xi and 113 (1939)

His interest in Sufism and theology is indicated by his association with Sūfis¹, Shaikhs and religious people in general. He may thus be assumed to have had a religious frame of mind, and his writings and the regard in which he was held by such bigoted Muhammadans as Al-Badāonī seem to indicate that he must have been quite orthodox in his views and observances.² Miṣṣan Kamāl-ud-dīn Husain of Shīrāz³, a well-known religious leader, wrote to Al-Badāonī after the Khwājah's death as follows: "For a long time I endured great grief and sorrow from hearing of the death of that repository of humanity, inseparably connected with liberality, him (*sic*) who had acquired all perfections, Mīrzā Nizāmu-d-dīn Ahmad, and from the passing away of all the excellence of that phoenix of the age and of his love and faithful affection for you, my lord." After his recall from Gujarāt in 1589 A.D., when he came into closer contact with the Emperor Akbar, he became less orthodox apparently in accordance with the prevailing atmosphere of the Royal Court, and does not appear to have looked askance at the innovations of the Divine Faith (*Dīn Ilāhī*) of the Emperor. Nizāmuddīn Ahmad's ruse in mentioning Shaikh Husain's name when some of the orthodox leaders⁴ were summoned to the Imperial Court, also indicates the skilful way in which he managed to keep himself safe from his own religious beliefs being questioned. This view is confirmed by Blochmann (*loc cit*, 1869, p. 138) who in commenting on the change in the religious feelings of Al-Badāonī resulting from his past misfortunes and exclusion from Akbar's Court, sums up the situation in the following sentences: "He may have found it necessary to assume a more conciliating attitude towards the 'heretics' of the Court, and the members

¹ *Vide Muntalhabu 't-tawārikh*, Haig's translation of vol. III, p. 167 (1925)

² See Al-Badāonī in Rankine's translation of vol. I of *Muntalhabu-t-tawārikh*, p. 9, where he is described as "a kind and complaisant man of wealth, orthodox and religiously disposed."

³ *Vide Muntalhabu 't-tawārikh*, Haig's translation of vol. III, pp. 186, 187 (1925)

⁴ *Vide* Haig's translation of *Muntalhabu-t-tawārikh*, vol. III pp. 137, 138, 151, and Lowe's translation of vol. II, p. 309

people (Lowe translates اهلِ سعادت as the people of piety), who were accompanying the army or were absent, prepared by the *Sadr-i-Jahān*, he arranged that Al-Badāonī, who was absent, be shown in the return as sick. In the 29th¹ year of Akbar's reign (991 A H, 1583 A D) the government of Gujarāt was transferred from Shihābuddīn to I'timād Khān who, after the murder of Sultān Mahmūd, had been the virtual king of Gujarāt till its conquest by Akbar in 980 A H, and Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad was appointed the *Bakhshī*². Abū Turāb's

Nizāmuddīn Ahmad's activities at Āgra in 974 A H referred to above and in the *Muntakhab* (text, vol II, p 99), states that Al-Badāonī met him at Āgra in 974 "and became his warm friend"

¹ Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad in the *Tabaqāt* (De's translation of vol II p 561, 1936) includes this in the account of the events of the 29th year which begins on page 558 and is followed by Al-Badāonī (Lowe's translation of vol II of *Muntakhabu't tauārīkh*, p 332) and in *Maāthir-ul-Umarā* (text edition, vol I, p 661). Abū-l-Fadl in *Albarnāma* (vol III, text edition, p 403, English translation, p 596) states, these appointments took place in the 28th year of the reign. In this connection reference may be made to De (*Tabaqāt*, English translation of vol II, p 559, note 1) where several discrepancies in the dates between *Albarnāma* and *Tabaqāt* are pointed out, the former places the various events enumerated by De a year advance of the dates given in the latter. Inaccuracies in regard to the reckonings of the years of Akbar's reign on the part of Nizāmuddīn Ahmad are pointed out by Al-Badāonī (*vide* Lowe's translation of vol II, pp 353, 363), and he explains these as being due to the author having not taken into account "the intercalated days, which every three years makes a difference of one lunar month, there is a difference in each cycle of a whole year, between the solar and lunar years", and his being away from the Imperial Camp in Gujarāt. After the death of Nizāmuddīn Ahmad the dates in the *Tabaqāt* were checked and at least one corrected by his son Muhammad Sharif. In spite of the above, as Al-Badāonī follows the *Tabaqāt*, it seems that the dates as they now stand in the *Tabaqāt* are the corrected dates.

According to Denison Ross (*A History of Gujarat*, introduction, p 5, 1909) the year in which 'I'timād Khan was made governor of Gujarāt' was 992 A H (1583 A D).

² Nizāmuddīn Ahmad's name is included in the list of *Bakhshīs* of Akbar's reign (*vide* Phillott's edition of Blochmann's translation of *Ā'in-i-Akbarī*, vol I, p 596), and apparently at this time no distinction was made between *Bakhshī* and *Mīr Bakhshī*, as what is called *Bakhshī*

account (*loc cit* pp 100 101) of these appointments is rather vague but in the *Tabaqat* (p 563) the author refers to his joining I tmad Khan at Bijapur *en route* to Ahmadabad after his appointment as the *Bakhshi*. The vacillating policy in reference to the affairs in Gujarat¹ adopted by I tmad Khan and the disturbances due to the intrigues of Shihabuddin Ahmad Khan and Qutbuddin Khan led to Ahmadabad being occupied by Nannu or Muzaffar Gujarati and the rout of the Imperial forces outside the town. The Khwajah sent an account of all that had happened to Akbar and as a result Mirza Khan² son of Bairam Khan was sent with a well equipped army to quell the disturbances in Gujarat. It is not necessary to deal here with the campaign against Sultan Muzaffar of Gujarat but a review of the period distinctly shows that throughout the campaign and earlier Nizamuddin Ahmad proved a very valuable officer and whether as a commander and even as an active fighter he gave a very good account of himself.

He successfully carried out negotiations with Shihabuddin made arrangements for the defence of Ahmadabad in the

in the *Tabaqat* is Mir *Bakhshi* in *Muntalhab ut tauarikh*. Abu l Faql in his introduction of the *Ain* (*vide* Phillott *loc cit* p 5) mentions the *Mir bakhshi* as one of the nobles of the State and Blochmann gives Paymaster of the court as its equivalent. For an account of *Bakhshi* see Banarsi Prasad *History of Shahjahan* (1932) page 276 from which it appears that this officer was the head of the Military Department and looked after recruitment reviews and other similar affairs connected with the army. Further distinction had been introduced in reference to the *Mir* or Chief *Bakhshi* while separate *Bakhshis* were attached to each division during military campaigns. According to Sarkar (*Mughul Administration* p 24 19 4) there were three subordinate *Bakhshis* at the end of Aurangzib's reign. In view of the above and the active part played by Nizamuddin Ahmad in the military campaigns and the administration of Gujarat the equivalents pay master (*De op cit*) and paymaster general (Lowe *loc cit* p 393) hardly appear to be appropriate. For a detailed discussion of *Bakhshi* and its various grades see Irvine—*The Army of the Indian Moghuls* pp 37-40 (1903).

¹ See Beveridge's translation of *Akbarnama* vol III pp 607-611 and *Tabaqat* De's translation of vol II pp 563-567.

Tabaqat De's translation of vol II pp 567 571 572 and Beveridge's translation of *Akbarnama* vol III p 613.

absence of the main force, defeated the forces of Sher Khān at Jūtānah, arranged for the attack on Muzaffar's forces by Quṭbuddīn Khān from Bahroj and Baroda, attacked Muzaffar's army from the rear at Saikhej which resulted in its defeat, and later was mainly responsible for the defeat of Muzaffar in the hills of Nādot. For his services in the Gujarāt campaign he was honoured with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour and an increase in his stipend. Later he carried out a successful campaign in Sorath and in the Ran of Kach. Mīrzā Khān, who had meanwhile been honoured with the title of *Khān Khānān*, was, at his own request, recalled to the Royal Court, and Nizāmuddīn Ahmad with Qulij Khān and Nauang Khān was left in charge of Gujarāt. During the *Khān Khānān's* absence Nizāmuddīn Ahmad proved a very energetic officer, and successfully carried out a protracted campaign against Muzaffar and his partisans in the Ran of Kach, and later subjugated the *Kolīs* and *Grāsī-yahs* in the neighbourhood of Ahmadnagar. His skill as a commander and administrator is indicated throughout all these campaigns by the fact of his skillfully arranging the movements of the troops, attacking the enemy before its forces could be consolidated, his ruse for the relief of Ākhār, launching vigorous rear attacks in various battles, the establishments of *thānas* or military posts and the construction of forts.

This very successful term of office culminated in the Khwājah's being summoned to the Imperial Court in 996 A.H., when A'zam Khān was appointed as the Governor of Gujarāt¹. Nizāmuddīn Ahmad traversed a distance of some 600 *karohs* in the course of twelve days, and reached Lāhore on the 3rd *Nauroz* of the 35th year of Akbar's reign. According to Al-Badāonī², Akbar gave orders that the camel-drivers should appear before him in the *Mahjar* in the same condition in which they had arrived, and they were a wonderful spectacle. After that he received boundless favours from the Emperor, and gained a great ascendancy over the mind of his royal patron. It was

¹ For details see *Tabaqāt*, De's translation of vol. II, pp. 563-595, where references to other works and several discrepancies in dates and the different accounts are noted.

² See Lowe's translation of *Muntakhabu't-tawārīkh*, vol. II, p. 384.

about this time that he was appointed in charge of the provinces of Ajmir Gujarat and Malwah apparently of the *Khalisa* lands ¹ Towards the end of *Shaban* 999 A.H. he was granted the *pargana* of Shamasabad as his *jagir* and was allowed five months leave of absence to arrange matters there In the year 1000 A.H. (1591-92 A.D.) when Āsif Khān *Balḥshī* was appointed to the Kābul campaign Nizāmuddīn Ahmad was appointed as the *Balḥshī* ² in his place

Nizāmuddīn Ahmad accompanied Akbar to Kashmir and apparently was a great favourite of the Emperor at this time His account of Kashmir is not very detailed and the history of Akbar terminates with the end of the 38th year of his reign The author describes it as having been written in a summary manner by the pen of broken writing but most of the great events have been succinctly narrated If life helps (me) and God's favour helps (me) the events of the coming years also, if the dear God so wills will be noted down and will be made a part of this worthy book Otherwise anyone who may be guided by the grace of God having engaged him self in writing it down, will attain to great good fortune ³

While staying at Lahore in attendance on the Emperor Nizāmuddīn Ahmad laid out or purchased a garden and it was in this garden that he was buried after his death At this time he is described by Al Bada'uni as having entered on affairs with great energy and activity He became the focus of all sorts of favours from the Emperor and the recipient of his perfect trust with regard to his ability good sense sincerity honesty and perseverance He would probably have risen to much greater heights but suddenly at the very acme of his eminence and the height of his activity, to the disappointment of the hopes of friends and strangers a dreadful blow was received from Fate and at the age of forty five he succumbed to a burning fever ⁴

¹ See Beveridge's translation of *Albarnama* vol III p 94

² See Lowe's translation of *Muntalḥabū t tawārīkh* vol II p 393 According to Lowe *Balḥshī* was the paymaster general

³ *Vide Tabaqat* De's translation of vol II p 602 The last sentence is quoted incorrectly in the life of the author in *Maathir ul Umara*

⁴ Lowe's translation of *Muntalḥabū t tawārīkh* vol II p 411

The events preceding his death are described in greater detail in *Albarnāma*¹ where it is stated that on 14th *Safar*, 1003 A H (19th October, 1594 A D), at Shāham 'Alī, near Lāhore, he developed high fever while on a hunting expedition with the Emperor. His sons obtained leave to convey him to Lāhore, but he died on the 23rd² *Safar* (28th October, 1594 A D) on the banks of the river Rāwī.

In the *Albarnāma* (*loc cit*) it is stated that Akbar's "discerning heart was somewhat grieved, and he begged for forgiveness for him at the court of God. Strangers and acquaintances mourned, and honesty (*rāstī*) indulged in grief."

Al-Badā'oni's account (*vide* Lowe, *op cit*, p. 112) is more detailed and is quoted here to indicate the regard and reverence in which he was held by all.

"There was scarcely anyone of high or low degree in the city, who did not weep over his bier, and recall his gracious qualities, and gnaw the back of the hand of regret." The last line of the *Qit'ah* which was composed on this occasion gives the year (1003 A H) of his death.

گوهری بہا ز دنیا رو³

(A priceless pearl has left the world.)

TĀRĪKH-I-AKBARĪ ITS SOURCES AND IMPORTANCE

Before dealing with the work itself it would be useful to add a note here regarding the various names assigned to it. The author in his introduction⁴ designated it the *Tabaqāt-i-*

¹ Beveridge's translation of *Albarnāma*, vol. III, p. 1005.

² Fardī Sirhindī in *Alhbar-Nāma*, as noted already, gives 22nd *Safar*, 1003 A H as the date of death of Khwājah Nizāmuddīn Ahmad Bakḥshī (*vide* Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol. VI, p. 130, 1875), this is certainly incorrect.

³ Text edition of *Muntakhab Al-Tawarikh* by Lees, Kabir al Dīn Ahmad and Ahmad Alī, vol. II, p. 398 (1865).

⁴ See De's translation of vol. I, p. 6 (1911). The date comes to 1001 A H (50+900+1+40+10) or 1592 A D. The author died in 1003 A H, 1594 A D, and he was apparently working at it for several years before his death. See Ranking's translation of *Muntalḥabu-t-tawā'ikh*, vol. I, pp. 9,

Albar Shahi and stated that the word *Nizami* the name of the author gives the chronogram of the date of its compilation. In *Raudat ut Tahirin* by Tahir Muhammad the work is called *Tarikh i Sultan Nizami*¹ but this name has not been adopted by any of the later writers. The work is called the *Tarikh i Nizami* by Muhammad Hashim Khafi Khan in *Muntakhab ul Lubab* (vide text edition in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series vol I p 238 1869). The same name was also used by Abd ul Qadir also known as Al Badaoni² in his *Muntakhab ut tauarikh* but he also calls it *Nizami t Tauarikh* (vide Ranking's English translation in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series vol I pp 9 10 1898). Firishtah (*Tarikh i Firishtah* Persian text Newal Kishore Press Lucknow p 4 1884) designated it as the *Tarikh i Nizamuddin Ahmad Bakhshi* and Col Briggs in his translation (*History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India* vol I Author's Preface p xlviii 1829) calls it *History of Nizamood Deen Ahmad Bakhshy*. Blochmann (*loc cit* p 115) as noted already calls it *Tabaqat i Nizami i Bakhshi*. Several manuscripts however bear the name *Tabaqat i Albari* and under this name the work is cited in various descriptive catalogues of Persian Manuscripts in most well known European libraries (for details

10 footnote p 1898). In this connection reference may also be made to Al Badaoni's remarks where in his description of the events of the year 1000 A.H. he says "Let not the intelligent reader be ignorant of the fact that as to that which has been written up to this point the source of the greater part of it is the *Tabaqat i Albari Shahi* (sic) the date of which I this erring author after much thought found to be *Nizami*. Having persuaded the said author to allow me I wrote a part of the book myself" (Lowe's translation of vol II p 403).

¹ Vide W. H. Morley *A Descriptive Catalogue of Historical Manuscripts* p 68 (1864) and Dowson in *Elliot's History of India* vol V p 177 (1873). For details of the work *Raudat ut Tahirin* see Beveridge *Journ As Soc Bengal (n.s.)* vol XIV pp 69-77 (1918). Unfortunately the only manuscript of this work in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (No 4² vide *Itanoff's Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts* p 13 1904) is incomplete and I have not therefore been able to verify this reference.

For a critical note in reference to *Al Badaoni* see Blochmann *loc cit* pp 119 120 (1869).

see M Hidāyat Hosain's preface to *Tārīkh-i-Shāhī*, p vii, footnote 1, 1939) This name was apparently first adopted by Elliot¹ who remarked that "the name by which it is best known in literary circles is *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī*", and this was also selected for the edition issued by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in preference to *Tabaqāt-i-Albar-Shāhī*, to avoid confusion with a work of the same name by Khwājah 'Atā Beg Qazvīnī written about 1014 A H, 1605 A D According to Ranking (*loc cit*) the work is simply known as 'Tabaqāt,' while Lees (*Journ Roy As Soc (ns)*) vol III, p 455, 1868) erroneously designates it as the '*Tārīkh-i-Tabakāt-i-Albar-Shāhī*'

Beveridge² in dealing with the sources of *Albarnāma* stated that the 'Tabaqat-Akbarī' and 'Badayuni's abridgment thereof' (*Muntalhab-ut-tawārīkh*) "were probably written under Akbar's orders or inspired by his action" In the introduction to *Albarnāma*³ while referring to Abū-l-Fadl's love for sources or the *Quellen*, he remarked that "to him we owe not only the *Albarnāma* but also the Memoirs of Gulbadan Begam, Jauhar the ewer-bearer, Bajazat (Bāyazīd) Biyat and perhaps Nizāmu-d-dīn's history" Neither of the two views is upheld by a study of the contemporary sources The work was started and completed by the author at his own initiative and there is no mention anywhere of either Akbar or Abū-l-Fadl having sponsored or inspired its compilation He certainly was helped⁴ in the work by such friends as Mīr Ma'sūm of Bhakkar⁵, 'Abdul Qādir Al-Badāonī⁶ and others, but the major part of the work

¹ Elliot's *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India*, vol I (the only volume ever issued), p 179 (1849) Also see *Elliot's History of India*, vol V, p 177 (1873)

² *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal (ns)* vol XIV, p 469 (1919)

³ *Albarnāma*, Beveridge's translation of vol III, introduction p xi (1939)

⁴ *Maāthir-ul-Umarā*, text edition, vol I, p 663

⁵ For an account of this great author, historian and administrator see *Ā'in-i-Akbarī*, Phillott's edition of Blochmann's translation of vol I, pp 578-580 (1939)

⁶ Lowe's translation of *Muntalhabu't tauārīkh*, vol II, p 403

was his own composition based on a study of several historical works and such independent information as he could collect from various sources by research and industry ¹ His history of the Akbar's reign is based on personal observations on information obtained from firsthand sources and probably to some extent on Abul Fazl's *opus magnum* the *Akbarnama* ²

In the introduction and dedication of the *Tabaqat Ahl-i-Hayat* Nizamuddin Ahmad explains the genesis of the work as follows

It came to the dull understanding of the author that he should with the pen of truth and candour write a comprehensive history which should present in a clear style in its different sections an account of the Empire of Hindustan from the time of Sabuktigin which began with the year 367 A H when Islam first appeared in the country of Hindustan to the year 1001 A H corresponding with the thirty seventh year of the Divine era which was inaugurated at the epoch making accession of His Majesty the vicegerent of God and should embellish the end of each section with the story of the victories of His Majesty's glorious army which is as it were an introduction to the sublime chronicle of renown then he should give a comprehensive account of all the victories and events and occurrences of His Majesty's reign each in its own place The details of these events are contained in the great history called the *Akbar nama* which that embodiment of all excellence the learned in all truths and knowledge the personification of worldly and spiritual perfection the favoured of his Majesty the Emperor the most erudite Sheikh Abul Fazl who is the preface of all excellence and

¹ The words in *Maathir* (*loc cit*) are

و حوں حر رسی و دہ در نفع احبار و سعی تمام بفرام آوردن

مواد نگار بردہ *

² I have included *Akbarnama* as one of his sources as it is mentioned in the introduction but in view of various discrepancies in the account in the *Tabaqat* and *Akbarnama* it is very doubtful whether he really utilized it to any extent in the compilation of his own History

eminence has written with his wonder-inscribing pen, and has made a chronicle for all times.¹

The history actually starts from about 377 A.H. corresponding to 986-987 A.D., and not 367 A.H. as stated by the author in the introduction. In account of the earlier years in a few lines merely introduces Amīr Nāsruddin Sabuktigin and can by no stretch of imagination be regarded as a history of those years. According to the author, as will be seen from the quotation above, he deals with the history of India up to the year 1001 A.H. corresponding to the thirty-seventh year of Akbar's reign and apparently it was this which was responsible for Mr. De describing it on the title-pages of volume I, both of the text and the translation, and of the text edition of volume II, as 'A History of India from the early Musalmān Invasions to the thirty-sixth year of the reign of Akbar'. The work, on the other hand, as is clear from a perusal of the author's concluding

¹ De's translation of the *Tabaqāt*, vol. I, p. v. The corresponding passage of the Persian text runs as follows:

دعای فاطر رسید - که تاریخی که جامع و مستمل بر تمامی احوال ممالک هندوستان باشد - بعارتی واضح از زمان سکتگیں، که سنه سحر و ستی و ثلثمائه - و ابتدا پاور اسلام در بلاد هندوستان است - تا سنه احدی و اله - موافق سی و هفتم سال الهی - که صداء آن از خلوس اند فریں حضرت خلیفۃ الہی است - طبقہ بر طبقہ مرقوم جامع صدق و سداد گرداند - و حاتمۃ هر طبقہ را فتح موی عالی آنحضرت که عدوان رفعت نامہ معاصرست - اتصال دهد آنگاه معہلی از جمیع فتوحات و واقعات و واردات حضرت خلیفۃ الہی که این محترمتر ناید بحالی خویش عرصہ بناند - و تفصیل این احوال - مقصود نہ کتاب عالیجات اکبرنامہ است - کہ افضل نداء - معارف و حقایق آگاہ - جامع کمالات صوری و معدوی - مقرب الخیرات الماٹانی - علامی شیخ ابوالفضل کہ دیناچۃ مکارم و معالیست - بقلم دلائع روم نگاشته صحائف، ایام ساخته *

It will be seen that جامع و مستمل بر تمامی احوال has been translated by Mr. De as "comprehensive", جامع صدق و سداد as "with the pen of truth and candour" and بعارتی واضح as "in a clear style"

paragraph of the account of Akbar's reign¹ succinctly narrates the events up to the end of the 38th year corresponding to 1002 A H (1593-1594 A D) and this is confirmed by a reference to the *Albarnama*². The consultation with the *Khan Khana*n regarding the Deccan campaign which took place after the 8th Du (or Di) of the 38th year near the town of Sultanpur (or Shrikhpur) is mentioned in the penultimate paragraph of the account of Akbar's reign in the *Tabaqat*. The mistake was corrected on the title page of the translation of volume II but to avoid ambiguity it would have been better to add the words 'the end of' before 'the thirty eighth year' or still better to use 'to the thirty ninth year of Akbar's reign'.

Excluding the *Albarnama* the author cites the following twenty eight works which he utilized in the compilation of his *Tabaqat*

- 1 *Tarikh-i Jamini*
- 2 *Tarikh-i Zain ul Albhar*
- 3 *Raudat us Safa*
- 4 *Taj ul Maathir*
- 5 *Tabaqat-i Nasiri*
- 6 *Khasain ul Futuh*
- 7 *Tughluq Namah*
- 8 *Tarikh-i Firuzshahi* by Darya Barni
- 9 *Futuh-i Firuzshahi*
- 10 *Tarikh-i Mubarakshahi*
- 11 *Futuh us Salatin*
- 12 *Tarikh-i Mahmudshahi Hindui* (Mandu according to Rieu)
- 13 *Tarikh-i Mahmudshahi Khurd Hindui* (Mandu according to Rieu)
- 14 *Tabaqat-i Mahmudshahi Gujarati*
- 15 *Maathir-i Mahmudshahi Gujarati*
- 16 *Tarikh-i Muhammadi*
- 17 *Tarikh-i Bahadurshahi*
- 18 *Tarikh-i Bahamani*

¹ *Tabaqat* De's translation of vol II p 65 (1936)

Albarnama Beveridge's translation of vol III p 936 (1910-1939)

- 19 *Tārīkh-i-Nāsrī*¹
- 20 *Tārīkh-i-Muzaffarshāhī*
- 21 *Tārīkh-i-Mīrzā Haidar*
- 22 *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr*.
- 23 *Tārīkh-i-Sind*
- 24 *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī*
- 25 *Wāqī'āt-i-Bāburī*
- 26 *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī*
- 27 *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī*
- 28 *Wāqī'āt-i-Hadīrat Jannat Āshiyānī Humāyūn Bādshāh*

Unfortunately some of the works cited in the *Tabaqāt* are not traceable, but I give below short bibliographical notes on the authorities referred to in the above list

1 *Tārīkh Al-Yamīnī*² by Abū Nasr Muhammad bin 'Abd al-Jabbār al-'Utbī is a history of the first two Ghaznavid sovereigns Subuktigin and Mahmūd. It was written about 411 A H (1020 A D). This work has been translated into Persian, and an English translation of the Persian version by Reynolds was published for the Oriental Translation Fund, London, in 1858. Full bibliographical details of this work were published by M. Hidāyat Hosain in his *Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Bazar Library*, vol II, pp 260, 261 (1923).

2 *Kitāb Zain-ul-Akhbār* by Abū Sa'id 'Abd-ul-Hayy bin ad-Dahhak bin Mahmūd Gardezī is a very rare historical work. Only two incomplete manuscripts³ of this work are known, one in the library of King's College, Cambridge (213), and the other in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Ouseley,

¹ Rieu (*Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, vol I, p 220, 1879) cites numbers 19 and 20 as a single work under the title '*Tārīkh i Nāsrī u-Muzaffarshāhī*', but in the text the two read as

تاریخ ناصری و تاریخ مظفر شاهی *

² ترجمه یمنی in Firsihtah and '*Tunjooma Yemuni*' in Briggs (*loc cit*, p 212).

³ For details see pages 1-4 of the Preface to Muhammad Nāzım's edition of sections 1-xiii of *Kitāb Zain 'l-Akhbār* (E. G. Browne, *Mem Ser* I, 1928).

240) it has further been suggested that the Bodleian manuscript is only a copy of the one at King's College Cambridge

Zam ul Akhbar is a general history of Persia from the Pishdadiyan dynasty dealing particularly with the governors and rulers of Khurasan up to ca 440 A H (1048 A D) Unfortunately a large portion of the work is lost but an edition of the first thirteen sections of the text was published by Muhammad Nazim¹

As is pointed out by Muhammad Nazim Khwajah Nizam uddin Ahmad Bakhshi was the first author to utilize this work for his account of the Ghaznavid sovereigns in the *Tabaqat Akbari* and the discovery of this rare work must remain to his credit Firishtah also includes *Zam ul Akhbar* amongst the sources of his *Tarikh* but in view of the fact that his account of the period dealt with in the *Zam* was based mainly on the *Tabaqat* it seems likely that he had only taken this reference from Nizamuddin Ahmad's list

3 *Raudat us Safa* by Muhammad bin Khwand Shah bin Mahmud Very little information is available about the birth or early life of the author but he is stated to have died at Herat in 903 A H (1497 A D) *Raudat* is a work on general history from the creation of the world to the author's time For details see *Habib us Siyar* Bombay edition volume II pp 198 339 and Rieu's *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum* vol I p 87 (1879) A full account of the work and translations of some extracts by Sir H M Elliot are published in *Elliot's History of India* vol IV pp 127-140 (1872)

4 *Taj ul Maathir* by Hasan Nizami of Nishapur deals with the history of part of the reign of Mu'izzuddin (assassinated 602 A H 1206 A D) the entire reign of Qutbuddin Aibak

¹ Vide note 3 p xxii The editor cites *Elliot's History of India* 186) as the first notice of this work This is incorrect as Elliot in his *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Mohammedan India* p 83 (1849) had published a detailed note regarding the Ouselev Manuscript No 240 which is now preserved in the Bodleian Library Oxford this was reprinted in *Elliot's History of India* vol IV pp 507 558 (1872) while the 1869 reference cited by the editor is only a casual notice of the work in vol II of the same publication (p 43)

(602–607 A H , 1206–1210 A D) and the first seven years of the reign of Shamsuddīn Iltutmish (1211–1217 A D) A detailed account of the *Tāj* was published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol II, pp 201–243 (1869), while Ethé in the *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office*, vol I, p 209 (1901) gives full bibliographic references

5 *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsnī* by Minhāj Sūāj Jūzjānī is a very valuable historical work from the earliest times to 658 A H (1259 A D) The author in honour of his patron Nāsiuddīn Mahmūd Shāh, king of Delhi (644–664 A H , 1246–1266 A D), named it *Tabaqāt-i-Nāsnī* A detailed account of the work was given in *Elliot's History of India*, vol II, pp 259–383 (1869) and vol VIII, pp 1–xxx1 (1877), and full bibliographical references are given in Rieu's *Catalogue*, vol I, pp 72, 73 (1879).

6 *Khazān-ul-Futūh* or the *Tārīkh-i-'Alāī* by Amīr Khusrau is a short but very important contemporary history of the reign of 'Alāuddīn dealing with the period 695–711 A H (1296–1312 A D) The work is very rare¹, only two manuscripts one in the British Museum (Or 1638) and the other in King's College Library, Cambridge, are known A lithograph edition² based on the British Museum manuscript was published under the editorship of 'Moinul Haq' in 1927, but, as has been pointed out by Dr Mirzā³, it is "full of mistakes, due either to faulty transcription or to careless editing"

In his excellent study of Amīr Khusrau Dr Mirzā (pp 222–225) has given a detailed list of contents of the historical material of the *Khazān-ul-Futūh* and discussed its literary peculiarities, Prof M Habīb⁴ in his introduction to the text-edition had also dealt with the literary peculiarities and the historical importance of this work

¹ For details see Mohammad Wahid Mirza—*The Life and Works of Amir Khusrau*, p 225, footnote 1 (*Punjab Univ Orient Pub*, Calcutta, 1935)

² *The Khazān-ul-Futūh* edited by Syed Moinul Haq (*Publications of the Sultana Hist Soc*, Algraah, 1927)

³ M W Mirza, *op cit*, p 225

⁴ English Introduction by M Habīb to M Haq's text edition, pp 1–15 (*vide Note 2 supra*)

7 *Tughluq Namah* by Amir Khusrau was quite unknown till recently as no copies of it are preserved in any of the European or Indian libraries Al Badaoni (*Muntakhab ut tauarikh* Ranking's translation of vol I p 301) remarks that it was the last of Amir Khusrau's works and was written in verse in honour of the Sultān and in obedience to his order. Ethe in his *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office* p 405 in the account of *Haft Iqlim* notes that the work consisted of 3 000 *bais* (verses). A manuscript entitled *Jahangirnamah* by Hayatī Kashī in the personal library of Maulana Ḥabīb ur Rihman Shirwānī of Habībganj was recently identified as the *Tughluq Nāmah* of Amir Khusrau by the late Maulvī Rāshid Ahmad Anṣārī. A detailed introduction a summary of this work by the editor Sayyid Hashmī Farīdābadī an incomplete descriptive note by Maulvī Rāshid Ahmad in Urdu and the text was published at Aurangabad Deccan in 1352 A H (1933 A D).

Relying on the statements in *Kashf uz Zunūn* and Abd ul Qadir Al Badaoni's *Muntakhab ut tauarikh* the *Tughluq Namah* is believed to have been composed in 725 A H (1325 A D) but some part of the work had been lost even in Akbar's time and in 1019 A H (1610 A D) Jahangir commissioned Hayatī Kashī to supply the missing parts to complete the work. The work as published is believed to be what has been preserved of Hayatī's revised version and consists of 2 920 verses. In view of the presence of a **كس** (catch word) on the last page of the manuscript and a statement by Hayatī (vide verses 168-177) that he intends to complete the work by adding some further verses at the end it is surmised by the editor that some of the folios at the end are missing. 179 verses in the beginning of the work are definitely identified as Hayatī's work leaving a balance of 2 742 verses¹.

¹ There is apparently a mistake in the number of verses assigned to Amir Khusrau as after deducting 179 of Hayatī's verses from the total number of 2 920 verse in the work the number should be 2 741 and not 2 742 as given on p 2 of the work. In this connection also see the critical account of M W Mirza *op cit* pp 245-253. He rightly does not include the *abyat* & *silsilah* or the rubrics in verse in the number of verses and is of the opinion that only 2 717 verses should be accepted as

by Amīr Khusrau. The editor in his introduction directs special attention to the historical importance of the work in connection with the following: the murder of Sultān Quṭbuddīn, the last of the Khaljī kings (716 A H, 1316 A D), annihilation of the 'Alāī dynasty, Khusrau Khān's short-lived reign of a few days¹, insurrection of the Tughluq (Ghāzī Malik later Ghīyāthuddīn Tughluq I), his correspondence with various *Amīrs*, advance to Delhi and victory over the usurper Khusrau Khān after two big battles, capture of Khusrau Khān and his brother, and finally his execution. This period (1316–1320 A D) marks the fall of the Khaljī and the rise of the Tughluq Dynasty. On comparing the accounts in *Tughluq-Nāmah* with that in the *Tabaqāt*, it appears almost certain that the author of the latter did not make much use of the former in compiling his account of the period under reference.

8 *Tārīkh-i-Firūzshāhī* by Dīyā Barnī is a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from the accession of Ghīyāthuddīn Balban, 662 A H (1266 A D), to the sixth year of Firūzshāh's reign, 758 A H (1357 A D.) It is the most important history of the period and was apparently the authority on which Nizāmuddīn Ahmad and Firishtah based their works. The work was published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series (1860–1862). A translation of the introduction and of the major part of the work was published by Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol III, pp 93–268 (1871).

9 *Futūhāt-i-Firūzshāhī* by the King Firūzshāh Tughluq (752–790 A H, 1351–1388 A D) is a record of "the edicts and ordinances of his reign, the abuses and evil practices which he has put down, the buildings, monuments and works of public utility which he has carried out." A translation of the entire work is published by Dowson in *Elliot's History of India*, vol III, pp 374–388 (1871).

being by Khusrau. For a detailed analysis of the work also see Husain's *The Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughluq* (London, 1938).

¹ The period of Khusrau Khān's reign, who took the name of Nāsir-ud-dīn Khusrau, was exactly two months, *vide Tughluq Nāmah*, pp 18, 19, from the 1st of Jumādā II to 1st Sha'bān, 720 A H (9th July to 6th September, 1320 A D).

10 *Tārīkh-i Mubarakshahi* by Yahyā bin Ahmad bin Abdullāh Sirhindī is a history of the Sultāns of Delhi from the time of Mu'izzuddin bin Sam the founder of the Ghurī Dynasty to 838 A H (1434 A D). It is the most reliable and in fact the only source for the history of the first three kings of the Sayid Dynasty from 817 A H (1414 A D) to 838 A H (1434 A D) and the accounts in the *Tabaqat* and *Firishtah's* History are not only based on it but in most cases are *verbatim* copies of Yahyā's account. An account of this work with extracts is published in *Elliot's History of India* vol IV pp 6-88 (1872) and the entire work was issued in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series in 1931 under the editorship of M. Hidayat Husain. An English translation by K. K. Basu was published in the *Gaekwad Oriental Series* No 1300 in 1932.

11 *Futuh us Salatin* by Iṣāmī (Khawajah Abd ul Mulk Iṣāmī according to Ethé¹) is a very important historical work in verse from the time of Subuktigin of Ghazni to Muḥammad bin Tughluq. The *Futuh* like the *Kitab Zain ul Akhbar* is a very rare work and only two manuscripts of it are known. Like the *Zain* it was first mentioned in the sources of the *Tabaqat-i Akbari* by Nizamuddin Ahmad and it appears that the references in *Firishtah*² and *Al-Bida'at*³ are only taken from the *Tabaqat*. Briggs⁴ was not personally acquainted with the work but remarked that the *Futuh* is an unimportant book of historical romances.

The text⁵ of the *Futuh* based on the manuscript in the India Office Library was issued in 1938 by Dr. A. Mahdi Husain.

¹ Etel H. *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* p 559 No 895 (1903).

² *Idē* page I of the English Preface of the text edition of the *Futuh us Salatin* edited by A. Mahdi Husain (Agra 1938).

³ *Tārīkh-i Firishtah* (Lucknow edition) p 13 (1884).

⁴ *Muntakhab Al-Tawarikh* text edition vol I p 236 (1868).

⁵ Ranking in his translation of this volume p 314 (1898) note 9 remarks: "I can find no mention of this work."

⁶ Briggs J. *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India* vol I p 406 (18-9).

⁷ *Idē* Note *supra*.

of Āgīa In the Urdū and English prefaces of this edition the editor briefly discusses the historical and literary merits of the *Futūh*, while a short critical notice is published in his monographic study¹ of Muhammad bin Tughluq Prof A S U'sha of Madras has also published an '*Isāmī Nāma* and discussed the merits of 'Isāmī's publications, but I have unfortunately not been able to refer to his publications², his views have been adversely criticized by M Husain and M Haq³. A critical review⁴ of the work is also being published in the Urdū monthly *Ma'ārif* by Sabāhuddīn 'Abd-ur-Rahmān

Futūh-us-Salātīn originally consisted of about 12,000 verses, but according to the editor, only 11,524 verses were found in the India Office manuscript, of these, nineteen verses (Nos 11294-11312) are quite illegible The work was completed in five months and nine days (10th December, 1349-14th May, 1350 A D) For his sources the author does not specify any special works, but states⁵ that he based his account on the *Hadīth*, various descriptive works, old legends, information gathered from friends and personal observations

Dr M Husain sums up the historical importance of the work as follows⁶ "It presents in tolerably accurate chronological order events of the political history of India for over three hundred years, and it also throws light on the beginning of the Bahmanī rule in the Deccan, on the psychology of the 14th century India, on the principal towns and their respective distances, on the nature of punishments then inflicted, on the Hindu amīrs and princes, and on the Hindi words and idioms then in Muslim usage" He further regards the *Futūh* as a

¹ M Husain, '*The Rise and Fall of Muhammad bin Tughluq*', pp 253, 254 and Preface pp xiv-xvi (London, 1938)

² References to Prof U'sha's contributions are given in M Husain and M Haq

³ M Haq, *Muslim Univ Journ*, vol V, No 2, pp 30-32 (1938)

⁴ *Ma'ārif*, vol XLIV, Nos 2-4, pp 109-127, 201-216, 279-298, in progress (1939)

⁵ *Vide* page 579, verses 11437-11443 of the text edition

⁶ *Vide* page 3 of the English Preface to the text edition

literary work of exceptional merit and Isami is the best epic writer of the age

Sabahuddin Abd ur Rahman in his critical review after comparing Isami's accounts with some contemporary sources such as the *Rihla* of Ibn Battuta, *Tarikh-i Firuzshahi*, *Tabaqat-i Nasiri*, *Tarikh-i Mubarakshahi* and other works is of the opinion that most of the legends and stories in the *Futuh* are not based on any historical facts. The historical data of the *Futuh* on the other hand are generally correct and even though involved and jumbled at times are valuable in supplying additional information and for clearing up details of several doubtful events. It is however not possible to adjudge the extent to which the *Futuh* was utilized in the compilation of the *Tabaqat*.

12-13 It has not been possible to identify the two works *Tarikh-i Mahmudshahi Mandwi* and *Tarikh-i Mahmudshahi Khurd Mandwi*. The works seem to be lost and no accounts of either beyond the references in the *Tabaqat* and Firsiht's History are now available.

14 *Tabaqat-i Mahmudshahi Gujarati*. No work of this title is known and it has not been possible to identify it with any other History of Gujarat.

15 *Maathir-i Mahmudshahi Gujarati*. This is also an unknown work but Rieu in his *Catalogue* vol III p 967 (1883) has suggested its possible identity with *Tarikh-i Mahmudshahi* of unknown authorship (manuscript No Or 1819 pp 966-967) and given full details of its contents.

16 *Tarikh-i Muhammad*. In the absence of the name of the author and in view of there being several works of this name it is difficult to be certain regarding the work referred to in the *Tabaqat* but if one were to hazard a guess it seems likely that the work cited is no other than the general history by Muhammad Bihramad Khani from the time of Muhammad to 842 A.H. (1438 A.D.) with special reference to India which is described in detail in Rieu's *Catalogue* vol I pp 84-86 (1879).

17 *Tarikh-i Bahadurshahi*. This work is referred to as a source of reference in various histories but it has not been possible to trace it. In *Elliot's History of India* vol VI p 484 (1875) it is referred to as a work by another individual who

wrote all the rest of the annals of Sultān Fīroz's reign, as well as those of the Gujarat sovereigns, under the title of *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāh* '.

18 *Tārīkh-i-Bahamanī* is another lost work which is only referred to in several historical works, but no copies of which are now available

19 *Tārīkh-i-Nāsiri* The work referred to is probably the History of Mālwah entitled *Tārīkh-i-Nāsireshāhī* by an unknown author described by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol III, p 968, MS No Or 1803, and not the famous *Tārīkh-i-Nāsiri* by Abū-l-Fadl Baihaqī which was edited by W H Morley and printed in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series in 1862

20 *Tārīkh-i-Muzaffarshāhī* by an unknown author is apparently a very rare work The only known manuscript (No Add 26, 279) of this history, so far I am able to find from the various sources, is preserved in the British Museum, London. It is described by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol I, p 287 (1879), as being an account of the siege and capture of Mandū by Muzaffar Shāh II, king of Gujariāt, in 924 A H (1518 A D)

21. *Tārīkh-i-Mīrzā Haidar* The correct title of the work is *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī*, but in the *Tabaqāt* it is cited as the *Tārīkh* of Mīrzā Haidar, after the name of its author This work is of special value in connection with the history of Kashmir An English translation with annotations was published by N Elias and E D Ross (1895)

22 *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr* The name of the author is not mentioned, but the work referred to in the *Tabaqāt* is probably the Persian translation of the *Rājataranginī* in Sanskrit which was completed by Mullā Shāh Muhammad of Shāhābād and revised by 'Abd-ul-Qādir Al-Badāonī in 999 A H (1590 A D) A full account of the work is given in Rieu's *Catalogue*, vol I, p 296 (1879)

23 *Tārīkh-i-Sind* by Mīr Ma'sūm Bhakkarī is also known as the *Tārīkh-i-Ma'sūmī* It deals with the history of Sind from the Muhammedan conquest to its final absorption in the Moghul Empire during Akbar's reign in 1001 A H (1592 A D) A detailed account of it is published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol I, pp 212-252 (1867), and the work has recently (1938) been printed

under the editorship of Dr U M Daudpota in the Government Oriental Series of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona

24 *Tarikh i Baburi* No work of this name can be traced and it appears as if the author of the *Tabaqat* had confused one of the Persian translations of *Tuzuk i Baburi* under this name (*vide infra*)

25 *Haqiqat i Baburi* In reference to this work also it is not possible to decide which of the Persian translations of the *Tuzuk i Baburi* is referred to by the author of the *Tabaqat*. The translation of Shaikh Zam or Zainu'd din of Khwaf was made during the lifetime of Emperor Babur (*vide Mrs Beveridge's Babur Nama* preface p xl 1921 and *Rieu's Catalogue* vol III p 926) a second one by Pivandah Hasan Ghaznavi and Muhammad Quli Mughal Hissari was begun in 991 A H (1583 A D) and completed in 994 A H 1586 A D (*vide Mrs Beveridge op cit* pp xliii xliiv and *Rieu's Catalogue* vol II p 799) and finally a third by Abd ur Rahim Khan Khanan which was made at Akbar's orders to help Abu l fazl in the *Akbar nama* and on its completion was presented to Akbar in 998 A H 1589 A D (*vide Mrs Beveridge op cit* p xliiv and *Rieu's Catalogue* vol I p 244)

26 *Tarikh i Ibrahimshahi* No work of this name is known and appears as if *Ibrahimshahi* is a *lapsus calami* on the part of the author of the *Tabaqat* for *Ibrahimi*. The *Tarikh i Ibrahimi*¹ also known as *Tarikh i Humayuni* by Ibrahim bin Harir (probably Jarir as suggested by Ethe) is a general history of the world from Adam to A H 596 (A D 1199) —see *Ethe's Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the India Office* p 33 No 104 (1903)

27 *Haqiqat i Mushtaqi* by Mushtāqi commonly known as Rizq Ullah is a collection of detached narratives and anecdotes relating to the sovereigns of the Lodi Timuride and Sur dynasties. An account of the work with translations of some extracts

¹ Not to be confused with *Tarikh i Ibrahim* which is another name for Firishtah's History *vide Elliot's Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muhammedan India* p 336 (1849)

is published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol IV, pp 534–557 (1872), while details regarding the almost unique manuscript in the British Museum are given by Rieu in his *Catalogue*, vol II, pp 820, 821 (1881)

28 *Wāqī'āt-i-Hadiyat Jannat Āshiyānī Hūmāyūn Bād-shāh* By this title Nizāmuddin Ahmad apparently means the *Tudhkhvat-ul-Wāqī'āt* by Jauhar Āftābchī, which is a useful source of reference in regard to Hūmāyūn's reign Details of this work are published in *Elliot's History of India*, vol V, pp 136–149 (1873)

On comparing the above list with Firishtah's sources it is found that the latter gives a list of 35 main works consulted by him for the compilation of his History, while another twenty are cited in the body of the work Of the works cited in the *Tabaqāt* Firishtah does not mention *Khazāin-i-Futūh*, *Tughluq-Namāh*, *Tārīkh-i-Nāsiri*, *Tārīkh-i-Minzā Haidar*, *Tārīkh-i-Bāburī* and *Tārīkh-i-Ibrāhīmshāhī*, while I have doubtfully identified Firishtah's *Tārīkh-i-Jāmī* (or *Hājī*) with Muhammad Bihāmad Khānī's *Tārīkh-i-Muhammadī* of the *Tabaqāt* In addition there are twenty works which are mentioned in the body of Firishtah's *Tārīkh* and which are included in a subsidiary list by Briggs. Of these, two, *Futūh-i-Salātīn* and *Wāqī'āt-i-Mushtāqī* (² Travels of Abool Nusr Nuskatty No 7 of Briggs's list), are also included in the *Tabaqāt* Firishtah's list includes the following additional works ¹ which are not mentioned in the list of the authorities in the *Tabaqāt*

- 1 *Mulhūqāt-i-Sharḥ 'Arnuddīn Bijāpurī*
- 2 *Bahman-Nāmāh of Sharḥ Ādharī*
- 3 *Tārīkh-i-Binakīti*
- 4 *Tuhfat-us-Salātīn Bahamanī* by Mullā Dāūd Bīdarī
- 5 *Tārīkh-Alfī*
- 6 *Habīb-us-Siyar*
- 7 *Tārīkh-i-Bangālah*
- 8 *Fawāid-ul-Fuwād*

¹ For this comparison I have used the lists as given in Briggs's translation of Firishtah entitled *History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India*, vol I, pp xlix–li (1829) Sources of Firishtah are also discussed by Mohl in *Journal des Savants*, pp 220–224 (1840)

- 9 *Khair ul Majalis*
- 10 *Nuskhah Qutbi*
- 11 *Siyar ul Ārifin*

The importance of the *Tabaqat i Akbari* lies in the fact that it was the first comprehensive history of India and that it served as the authority on which several later historical works were based.

The opinion of Abd ul Qadir Al Badaoni the author of the *Muntakhab ut tawarikh* has already been referred to. Up to the year of Nizamuddin Ahmad's death his history though embellished with additional facts is an abridgment of the *Tabaqat*¹ and *Tarikh i Mubarakshahi*. He corrected some of the dates of the *Tabaqat* but mainly relied on it for the historical facts.

Several chapters of the *Raudat ut Tahirin* by Tahir Muhammad which was written between 1011 A H (1602-1603 A D) and 1015 A H (1606-1607 A D) are according to Elliot (*op cit* p 300) copied *verbatim* from the *Tabaqat*.

Muhammad Qasim Firishtah pronounced the *Tabaqat* to be defective but borrowed from it very freely and has formed his own history of Hindustan and the Decern entirely on the same plan (Elliott *op cit* p 178). This opinion is fully borne out by the running commentary of the *Tarikh* provided by Mr. De in his very valuable footnotes in the translation of the *Tabaqat* particularly in volume III.

The *Tarikh i Shahi* (or *Tarikh i Salatin i Afghana*) was composed soon after the compilation of the *Tabaqat* (before 1594 A D) and before 1020 A H (1611 A D) when the *Makhzan i Afghani* was written (Elliot's *History of India* vol V pp 1-2 1873). The author Ahmad Yadgar mentions Nizami's History or the *Tabaqat* and *Ma dan i Akhbar* as his authorities and as M. Hidayat Hosain has recently shown he has copied *verbatim* the account of the reign of Humayun from the *Tabaqat*.

¹ According to *Elliot's Bibliographical Index of the Historians of Muhammedan India* p 221 (1849) Al Badaoni in his work *Niyatu'r Rashid* designates his own history as a mere abridgment of the *Tabakat*.

1 vide M. Hidayat Hosain's text edition of *Tarikh i Shahi* Preface pp 6-7 (1939).

Maāthiri-ī-Rahīmī by Mullā ‘Abd-ul-Bāqī Nahāvandī was composed in the year 1025 A H (1616 A D). The first volume of this work dealing with the general history of India appears, from its contents and descriptions, on almost identical lines, to be based mainly on the *Tabaqāt Maāthiri*’s style and language are superior to those of the *Tabaqāt*, but there can be little doubt that the historical part is only a copy of the latter. This view is confirmed by the fact that the detailed account of Akbar’s reign in the *Maāthiri* ends with the 38th year of his reign; the author in this connection adds that as the narrative in the *Tabaqāt* ends with this year and as he has not been able to obtain any detailed history of the remaining fourteen years of the reign, he has not been able to include a detailed account of this period.¹

M. ‘Abdul Muqtadir in the Preface² to the *Haft-Iqlīm* (completed 1002 A H, 1593 A D) of Amīn Ahmad Rāzī remarked that “for the Indian portion of the history he relies mainly upon the *Tabaqāt-ī-Akbarī*”

Muntakhab-ul-lubāb by Muhammad Hāshmi, better known by his nickname of Khāfi Khān, is a very valuable general history of India from the Muhammadan conquest to the reign of Muhammad Shāh, Emperor of Delhi (1719–1748 A D). It was published in 1145 A H (1732 A D). The author³ states that Nizāmuddīn Hāiawī, who was one of the *Bakhshīs* of the Emperor Akbar, wrote a comprehensive history of the twenty-one *Sūbas* of the Deccan and included in it the history of Akbar up to the 37th year of his reign. His account of the Sultāns of the Deccan in general is not reliable, and with reference to the accounts of the Sultāns of this region the author has not come across any other historical work, except that of Muhammad Qāsim Firishtah, which can be fully relied upon. As Nizāmuddīn had, however, been in the service of the Emperor Akbar throughout his life, his

¹ See M. Hidāyat Hosain’s text edition of *Ma’āsiri-ī-Rahīmī*, vol. I, p. 933 (1924).

² *Bibliotheca Indica* edition of *Haft Iqlīm* by E. D. Ross and M. ‘Abdul Muqtadir, p. vi (1918).

³ *Vide* Kabiruddin Ahmad and Ghulam Qadir’s text edition in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, vol. I, pp. 237–243 (1869).

narrative of the reign of this King can be fully relied upon and he bases his account of the *Panj ha arı* and *Chahar hazarı* Amirs and of some of the religious great men and poets on the *Tabaqat*

Albar Nama of Shaikh Ishaq Firdi Sirhindi is according to Dowson¹ except for the account of the services rendered by his patron Shaikh Farid Bukhari and some scraps of poetry and some wonderful stories, only a compilation from the *Tabaqat* and *Albarnama* of Abu'l Fadl. It ends with 1010 A H (1602 A D) the year in which Abu'l Fadl's work was completed.

Various other historical works of a later date have either based their accounts on or borrowed from the *Tabaqat* but it is not necessary to deal with them here.

Of the authors in English it is only necessary to note that the *Tabaqat* is regarded by Elliot, Erskine Elliot and Dowson, Lees, Ranking, Wolseley Haig, Beni Prasad and others as amongst the best Persian histories and the most reliable sources of our information.²

It was the first comprehensive work which dealt with the history of India to the exclusion of the other Asiatic countries and in which the histories of different provinces were dealt in a strict historical sequence. It must also be remembered that the author was primarily a court official, an administrator and a soldier, not a *waqı ah navis* or a court historian. Historical work was with him a labour of love and being an officer with other more pressing duties this was carried out by him with the help of his protégés under very unsettled conditions of life. His work also must not be judged by the modern standards. As Elliot admirably summed up in his learned preface³ the works of the Muhammadan historians can hardly be regarded as ranking higher than annals. They comprise for the most part nothing but a mere narration of events conducted with reference to chronological sequence without speculation on causes or effects without a reflection or suggestion which

¹ Dowson in *Elliot's History of India* vol VI pp 116-146 (1875)

² Vide Beni Prasad *History of Jahangir* p 44^o (1930)

³ Vide Elliot *Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan India* Preface pp v-xxx (1849)

is not of the most puerile or contemptible kind; and without any observation calculated to interrupt the monotony of successive conspiracies, revolts, intrigues, murders, fratricides so common in Asiatic Monarchies ' With the restraining influences of ostracism and even death under the despotic monarchs during whose times these histories were compiled there could hardly be any chance for the development of individual character or the expression of unbiassed opinions In common with the authors of the times, and this was not restricted to Muhammadan authors only, Islam in the *Tabaqāt* is lauded above all other religions, the Muhammedans are of the true faith and all others are infidels, when the former are killed in battle or otherwise they drink "the cup of martyrdom", while the souls of the infidels "are despatched to hell" Patriotism and bravery of the *Kāfirs* are condemned in very strong terms, while even cowardice, intrigues, wholesale massacres and desecration and demolition of the religious institutions of the Hindūs are applauded All the same the author deserves full credit for being far in advance of his times and to a great extent free from religious bigotry when he, as against Diyā Bainī, the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Firūzshāhī*, who describes Khusrau Khān on the occasion of his battle with Ghazī Malik "as the effeminate wretch who could not bear the attack of men", applauds him as "having with great bravery and courage fought to the end of the day" ¹

Similarly in narrating the chivalrous treatment of Sultān Mahmūd at the hands of Rānā Sānkā (Sangrāma Singh, Rānā of Mewār) and restoring to him the kingdom of Mālwah after the former's defeat and capture by the latter, Khwājah Nizām-uddīn ² shows himself a true historian untrammelled by any religious bigotry or prejudices In dealing with Akbar, his king and patron, he employs the usual eulogistic high sounding

¹ Vide De's translation of vol I of the *Tabaqāt*, p 207

² *Tabaqāt* text edition, vol III, p 203

در صفات اهل بصورت نوشیده نماد - که کار رانا سانکا از سلطان مطهر
 بالآخر سب - چه سلطان مطهر بناه برده را مدد نمود - و رانا سانکا دشمن را
 در حرب گرفته سلطان داد - و مثل این قصه عریب نا عاب معلوم نیست *

titles and phrases but cannot like Abu l Fadl¹ be accused of uncouth flattery both in form and style or of wilful concealment of facts. As a historian he casually mentions the Divine Faith but does not go into any great detail regarding the observances of the faith or criticize the Emperor Abu l Fadl and any of the other followers. He was writing a history of the period from personal observations and information collected from all available sources and has succeeded more than any other author of his time in producing what Dowson² rightly styles a contemporary history of very high authority.

The *Tabaqat* does not exhibit much literary talent and is not written in any ornate style. The language is fairly simple and vigorous but not grandiose and highly polished. It is more of the Afghan type which is quite different from the almost pure Persian of Irān used by Firishtah or Mullā Abd ul Baqī Nāhwandī the author of *Maathir-i Rahimī*. Arabic quotations are only sparingly used but the dates are invariably given in Arabic rather than Persian. The narrative owing to long sentences is often involved rather disjointed and even fragmentary but as few metaphors and similes are used there is seldom any difficulty in comprehending the exact meaning of the author.

BRAJENDRANATH DE³

(1852-1932)

Mr. Brajendranath De was born at Calcutta on the 23rd of December 1852 in his maternal grandfather's house in Simla.

¹ See Blochmann's *Ā'in-i Akbari* (Phullott's revised edition) Preface pp vii viii (1933) Beveridge's translation of *Akbarnama* vol III introduction pp xi xii (1939) and Wolseley Haig in *Cambridge History of India* vol IV p 111 (1937).

Elliot's History of India vol V Preface p vii (1833)

² The life of the author is based on a typescript of an autobiography entitled *Reminiscences of Mr. Brajendranath De, an Indian Member of the Indian Civil Service* which was kindly placed at my disposal by his son Mr. H. K. De, Barrister at Law to whom I tender my grateful thanks. A short Life of Mr. De written by M. Hidayat Hosain was published in the *Proceedings* for 1933 pp clxxv-clxxxvii in *Journ. Asiatic Soc. Bengal* vol XLIX for 1933 (1934).

near the Cornwallis Square His parents were *Kayasthas* and, as the author writes, belonged to "the middle class section of well-born or as they are commonly called *bhadralok* people" His mother was one of the *garbhkātā* Basu families of Annapur His early days were spent partly in the home of his maternal ancestors and partly in his paternal home at Bhawanipur which in those days formed one of the suburbs of Calcutta Brajendranath was the eldest child of the family, and though he had nine or ten brothers and sisters, all except one died in their infancy The author remarks "it is, therefore, curious that I have lived so long, and on the whole have enjoyed such remarkably good health I have no doubt that it is due to the fact that I have lived an abstemious, active and regular life, have taken considerable care of myself and have been more or less well-occupied" During his childhood, however, he suffered from various ailments, but he notes that he was in good health from 1862 onwards when his father migrated to Lucknow He was very fond of religious stories and *sankirtans* (religious musical performances in honour of Krishna or Vishnu) and apparently these greatly impressed him during the early years of his life He was a favourite companion of his grandmother, and her austere, religious and simple life greatly influenced him in his younger days

Like all Hindu boys of the period, he had to go through what was known as the *hāte kharī* (chalk in hand) ceremony This took place when he was 5 years old, on the '*Sripanchami* and *Saraswati Puja*' day, the old family priest after offering '*pujas* to the family *Saligram* and *Saraswati*' (the Goddess of Learning) placed a small cylindrical piece of hard grey chalk in the boy's right hand and guided him in writing the entire Bengali alphabet on the hard floor of the room where the ceremony was performed In connection with his earlier education the author remarks, "My father had a deep-rooted antipathy equally to indigenous *pathshalas* and to missionary schools, which was perfectly justified in the case of the former, but not so well in the case of the latter, and I therefore never went to any institution of either of these classes" He was first sent to a school in Chakraberia, but soon afterwards was transferred

to the Nandan Brothers Academy both these institutions were located in Bhawanipur. He then migrated to a school in Chor bagan and later to the Colootolah Branch School now known as the Hare School and it was here that he was educated up to the Vth standard.

The migration of his father to Lucknow in 1862 to take up his appointment in Government service has already been mentioned but the family including the young Brajendranath did not join him till 1865. Lucknow in those days as the author remarks was in every way different from Calcutta. The men and women were differently built more sturdy and stalwart than the puny men and women we had known in Calcutta. They were differently dressed and spoke a different language. The houses were built in a different style and in fact the entire atmosphere was quite different from that of Calcutta.

At Lucknow young Brajendranath was admitted in the Canning School which later developed into the Canning College and finally into the Lucknow University of the present day. It was there that he suddenly blossomed forth into what he styles a veritable prodigy. In spite of the fact that he was greatly handicapped by having to learn an entirely new second language he reached the top of his class at the end of 8-9 months and for the six or seven years during which he was at this school he was always at the top of his class. He passed the Entrance (the Matriculation) Examination in December 1867 in the 1st division. The Intermediate Examination he passed in 1869 standing 4th in order of merit in the whole of the Calcutta University. He passed the B.A. Examination in the 1st division and after studying for a few months more the M.A. Examination in the 1st class in 1871.

He started studying Sanskrit for his Intermediate Examination and his fondness for this language continued unabated to the end of his life. During this period also he started learning Persian with a *Maulvi* (Persian teacher) at home who according to the author was given the magnificent monthly salary of Rs 4 for two hours tuition every day. With this *Maulvi* he used to read various *Insha's* or collection of letters among which he mentions *Insha-i-Madhūrām*. Even at this age

young Brajendranath was very good in languages, particularly in English, Sanskrit and Persian, but he was rather deficient in Mathematics, and in spite of hard work he was not able to make up this deficiency

After passing the M A Examination and even before he had been thinking of going to England to compete for the Indian Civil Service, the authorities of the Canning College, in view of his brilliant career, recommended the award to him of a scholarship of Rs 200 a month, but the Chief Commissioner of the province turned down the proposal on the grounds of his being a Bengali and the son of a ministerial officer of the Government. The College authorities, however, awarded him a scholarship of Rs 50 a month for a period of about 6 months till he could appear in the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service. The family finances at the time were in none too flourishing a condition, so in the middle of July, 1872, young Brajendranath, with only Rs 1,300, sailed for England. On his arrival in London he joined the University College, and appeared in the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service held in April, 1873. Only 35 of the 350 candidates that appeared for this examination that year were selected for the Indian Civil Service, and Brajendranath was 17th in the list. The author attributes this rather low position to his having selected Mathematics as one of the subjects, in which he obtained very low marks, his proficiency in English, Sanskrit, Persian and Mental Science, however, enabled him to pass the Civil Service Examination and secure a fairly high place amongst the selected candidates. *En passant* it may be mentioned that he was the 8th Indian who passed the I C S Examination.

Brajendranath De in the meanwhile had joined the Middle Temple Inn and was studying for the Bar. Without much work he passed the law examinations, and having kept the full complement of twelve terms, was called to the Bar. After being selected for the Indian Civil Service, he went into residence at the Oxford University, and before leaving England, in July 1875, was awarded the Boden Sanskrit Scholarship. In addition to this during the period of his probation in England he won a number of prizes in the half-yearly examinations for proficiency in

languages At Oxford he attended the lectures of Prof Max Muller and Mr Ruskin and also used to attend regularly the meetings of the Union of which Mr H H Asquith (later Earl of Oxford) was the President

On the return journey he travelled extensively on the Continent and returned to Calcutta in September 1875 Soon afterwards he was posted to Arrah as the Assistant Magistrate Collector and during his service he served as a Collector in various districts of Bengal and twice officiated as the Commissioner of the Burdwan Division After full thirty five years service he retired in September 1910 from Hooghly where he was then serving as the Magistrate and Collector

Shortly after his return he turned his attention to the language examinations which had been instituted with a view to inducing young civilians and other officials to acquire proficiency in classical languages like Sanskrit Persian and Arabic and the Indian vernaculars Being a Bengali by birth and in view of his having been educated at Lucknow he was debarred from appearing in the examinations in vernaculars such as Bengali Hindi and Hindustani but the examinations in classical languages were open to him There used to be 3 examinations in each language (1) the Higher Standard for which there was a prize of a comparatively small monetary value (2) the High Proficiency for which a prize of Rs 2 000 in each language was awarded to each successful candidate and (3) the *Degree of Honour for which there was a prize of Rs 5 000 for Sanskrit and Arabic and Rs 4 000 for Persian* He passed the Higher Standard Examination in Sanskrit and High Proficiency Examination in Persian In the Degree of Honour Examination for Sanskrit he appeared without even passing the High Proficiency Examination and was declared successful on the very first occasion Here it would not be out of place to mention that in connection with the Persian examinations he had to face a serious difficulty in regard to his pronunciation As he says

Persian is pronounced in one way by Delhi and Lucknow *Maulvis* or scholars and in another way by the Persians themselves I had read Persian originally in Lucknow and I pronounced Persian as it is pronounced there His examiners

did not consider this correct and to acquire the pure Persian accent he studied for two months with Shaikh Mahmūd Gilānī, a famous Persian coach in Calcutta of those days. During this period he read through various text-books with the help of the learned Shaikh, and in addition studied a work called *Qasā'id Badar-i-Chāch* or the Odes of Badar Chāch. Brajendranath was not greatly impressed by the literary merits of this work, as he considered its language "very inflated and involved", but he read it for his examination and this training was later useful to him in the preparation of the text and translation of the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*.

After his retirement Brajendranath settled down in Calcutta and in view of his early love for Persian, volunteered to prepare for the Asiatic Society a properly collated edition of the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* for publication in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series and also to translate this important historical work into English. He started this work in 1911, but, as has been remarked earlier, the publication of the work did not proceed smoothly, in fact after the issue of the first fascicles of the text and translation in 1913 the work remained in abeyance till 1925. The exact position about the end of 1924 is summed up by the author as follows: "I had commenced the work in 1911, but had given it up owing to some difference with the authorities of the Asiatic Society. I now took up the work again at the request of Mr van Manen the General Secretary, who sent Shamsul Ulema Maulvi Hidayat Hosam to my house to ask me to do so. I readily consented, and I have gone on with the work as quickly as the state of my health and my other occupations have allowed me to do."

In view of the rather unsatisfactory nature of the available manuscripts and the peculiar style of Nizāmuddīn Ahmad, the work of collation and translation of the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* must have been not only difficult, but extremely arduous. In spite of all these difficulties and his failing health Mr Brajendranath De persevered in his task, and produced six volumes of the text and translation which will stand as monuments to his industry and scholarship. Only those who have attempted translating Persian works into English can realize the onerous

nature of such undertakings. As Ranking¹ rightly remarked

The inherent differences of idiom in the two languages the rich expansiveness of the one and the rigid inflexibility of the other render the attempt to fitly represent the glowing colours of Persian in the dull monotone of modern English all but hopeless. It has been said that the test of a translation is not its literalness but its truth that is to say not its fidelity to the author's expression but its response to his inspiration. It must not merely reproduce the latter it must embody the spirit of the original composition.

Mr. Des'wori fully conforms to these high ideals for a faithful translation while the numerous very critical footnotes in the various volumes add materially to its importance as a work of reference. It is sad that the work could not be completed before his demise on the 28th of September 1932 at the ripe old age of about 80 years.

The author summed up his autobiography as follows

'I am over 76 years of age which considering the short lived race and family from which I have sprung must be considered a very great age. I have enjoyed fairly good health and have had an active life except during the last four or five years when my age and the infirmities which are incidental to it have had their usual effect on my health and my activities and energy. I am thankful however to remember that I am not bed ridden but can still attend to the ordinary business of life and to my literary pursuits such as they are. A certain amount of success has crowned my life though in my discontented moments I have sometimes thought that it has not been all that I have deserved but I am fully aware of the limitations and deficiencies under which I have worked and probably in this well ordered world no one gets more or less success than he merits. I have lost some very near and dear ones but I thankfully remember that others are left to cheer and comfort me in my old age.

¹ Translator's Preface to the translation of vol. I of the *Muntakhab t-tawarikh* p. 1 (1898)

Mr Brajendianath De had a charming personality. His circle of friends was wide and all who knew him respected him for his honesty, straightforwardness and gentle nature. Though rather shy and somewhat reserved, he was very generous and kind hearted, and was possessed of a subtle sense of humour.

He joined the Asiatic Society of Bengal as a Member in 1904, but retired in 1912. He rejoined the Society in 1926, and served as a member of the Council during the years 1928-29 and 1929-30. During these periods the writer of this note had exceptional opportunities of working with him as a colleague and well remembers his genuine interest in the work of the Society, particularly in its Oriental publications. He resigned his membership of the Society in 1931.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Normally I would have started this preface with an *apologia*, but on maturer consideration I decided to leave this unpleasant infliction till the end. I have no pretensions to being either a historian or a scholar of Persian, but I must confess to having a more than usual interest for the history of my country, while from my childhood Persian has been like a second mother tongue to me. In April last when the Publication Committee of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal had to face the Augean task of resuscitating and completing several publications which had lain dormant for many years, the question of completing and editing the translation of the third and final volume of the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* also came up for consideration. As scholars with the rare combination of an expert knowledge of Persian and English, and of Indian History are rather rare, and none with the necessary leisure to do this voluntary work for the Society could be found amongst its members or well-wishers, this work, in accordance with the couplet of Hāfiz

آسمانِ نازِ اِمداد ، نتواند ، کشید

فرعۂِ مالِ دِنامِ منِ دیوانہِ ردد

was assigned to me. None of my critics would be more capable of disapproving this unbecoming choice, but rather than let the

work remain incomplete with the serious consequences of an already almost illegible manuscript becoming quite useless if left till such time when some really suitable editor could be found for completing it. I agreed to undertake the work. Even good intentions and resolutions have their limitations and on looking through the material I found an almost impossible task before me. The manuscript as remarked above was very nearly illegible it had been written in a type of shorthand which though it would have been quite simple for its author to transcribe was quite beyond an ordinary reader it took me a long time to master and the deciphering of the diacritical marks involved a great deal of labour. There was also an uncorrected typewritten copy but this differed materially from the manuscript. Further there were long blanks and very few if any of the text quotations or references had been filled in. Even in the manuscript the references were without page indications and this involved a great deal of reading of the original sources. The quotations from different works were often incorrect being paraphrases by the author rather than the original versions, while the names of persons and places though given in inverted commas were almost without exception spelt differently from what they were in the originals. This should not however be understood to mean that I am in any way trying to disparage the work of the author or to cast any aspersions on his scholarly attainments but in fairness to him and myself I have considered it essential to explain the situation with which I was faced. Several times I felt like giving up the task but knowing as I did the great amount of time and labour which in spite of his failing health and eyesight my late lamented friend Mr. Brajendranath De had put into the work I persevered in completing it as best as I could. My own share in the publication is limited to standardizing the transliteration as far as possible checking verifying and correcting the all too numerous references supplying missing passages in the translation comparing it with the text edition which had been changed materially since the translation was prepared pointing out variations between the text and translation where it would have meant changing the entire account and finally seeing the work through

the press All this has involved a tremendous amount of work, more particularly as I could, with the responsibilities of my official position, only devote my few leisure hours to this work In presenting the work, as now issued, I am fully conscious of its shortcomings and while craving the indulgence of my readers, only hope that in view of the circumstances explained, they will make due allowances for the defects ¹

Acknowledgments In preparing these volumes for the press I have been materially assisted by my friend Shams-ul-'Ulama Khān Bahādur Hidāyat Hosain, the Joint Philological Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, and I take this opportunity of offering him my very grateful thanks for the help which he gave so ungrudgingly at all times I am also indebted to Prof Chintaharan Chakravarti for help in connection with the revision and correction of the Sanskrit portions in the Kashmīr section of the work My thanks are also due to Messrs P Knight, N A Ellis, and G E Bingham of the Baptist Mission Press, Calcutta, for assistance in connection with the printing of this work Owing to its multi-lingual nature this work presented exceptional problems, both in type-setting and the correction of the proofs, but, as usual, the Baptist Mission Press rose fully to the occasion, and the close co-operation and ever-ready help of the gentlemen mentioned above made it possible for me to complete the publication in a little over six months The index is being prepared under my supervision by Shāh Mu'inuddīn Ahmad, the 1st *Maulvī* of the Society, and will be issued as soon as possible

Museum House, Calcutta

BAINI PRASAD

28th October, 1939

¹ Unfortunately widely different schemes for the transliteration of the names of authors and their publications are adopted by different authors The originals are strictly followed for the citations in the footnotes, but the transliterations in the text are, except where within inverted commas, in accordance with the scheme recommended by the International Oriental Congress of 1894

CONTENTS

(PART I)

	PAGE
SECTION I THE SULTANS OF THE DAKIN TWENTY NINE PERSONS	I
1 An account of the reign of Al ⁱ ud din Hasan Shah	7
2 An account of the reign of Sultan Muhammad Shah son of Ala ud din Hasan Shah	11
3 An account of the reign of Mujahid Shah	19
4 A narrative of the reign of D ⁱ ud Sh ⁱ h son of the uncle of Mujahid Shah	1
5 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Muhammad Shah son of Mahmud son of Bahman Shah	~
6 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Gh ⁱ yas ud din	4
7 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Shams ud din brother of Sultan Gh ⁱ yas ud din	5
8 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Firuz Shah	27
9 A narrative of the reign of Sultan Ahmad Shah Bahmani	4~
10 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Ala ud din son of Ahmad Shah	56
11 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Humayun Shah son of Sult ⁿ Ala ud din	6
12 An account of the reign of N ⁱ zim Sh ⁱ h son of Humayun Shah	86
13 An account of the reign of Muhammad Shah son of Humayun Sh ⁱ h	93
14 An account of the reign of Shihab ud din Mahmud Shah son of Muhammad Sh ⁱ h La ⁱ hlari	109
15 An account of the reign of Ahmad Shah son of Mahmud Shah	13~
16 An account of the reign of Sultan Ala ud din son of Mahmud Sh ⁱ h	133
17 An account of the reign of Sult ⁿ Wali ul lah son of Mahmud Shah	134
18 An account of the reign of Kalim ul lah son of Mahmud Shah	134
SECTION II THE NIZAM UL MULKI LINE OR DYNASTY	136
1 An account of Nizam ul mulk Bahri	136
2 An account of Ahmad son of Nizam ul mulk Bahri	137
3 An account of Burhan N ⁱ zam ul mulk son of Ahmad	137
4 An account of Husain N ⁱ zam ul mulk son of Burhan	140
5 An account of Murtada Nizam ul mulk	145
6 An account of Hu ⁱ am Nizam ul mulk son of Murtada Nizam ul mulk who was called Miran Husain	151
7 An account of Isma ⁱ l Nizam ul mulk son of Burhan	155
8 An account of the rule of Burhan Nizam ul mulk son of Husain son of Burhan who is the brother of Murtada	157

	PAGE
SECTION III THE DYNASTY OF 'ĀDIL <u>KHĀN</u>	159
1 An account of the rule of Yūsuf 'Ādil <u>Khān</u>	159
2 An account of Ismā'il 'Ādil <u>Khān</u> , son of Yūsuf	160
3 An account of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil <u>Khān</u> , son of Ismā'il <u>Khān</u>	161
4 An account of 'Alī 'Ādil <u>Khān</u> , son of Ibrāhīm	162
5. An account of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil <u>Khān</u> (son of Tahmāsp), who was a nephew of 'Alī 'Ādil <u>Khān</u>	165
SECTION IV THE QUTB-UL-MULKIYA LINE OR DYNASTY	167
1 An account of Sultān Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī	167
2 An account of Jamshīd Qutb-ul-mulk, son of Sultān Qulī	168
3 An account of Ibrāhīm Qutb ul-mulk, son of Sultān Qulī	169
4 An account of Muhammad Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk, son of Ibrāhīm	171
SECTION V ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF GUJRĀT	172
1 (An account of) A'zam Humāyūn Zafar <u>Khān</u>	173
2 An account of the accession of Tātār <u>Khān</u> , son of A'zam Humāyūn Zafar <u>Khān</u>	182
3 An account of the reign of Zafar <u>Khān</u> who had the title of Muzaffar Shāh	184
4 An account of Sultān Ahmad Shāh, son of Sultān Muhammad, son of Sultān Muzaffar	189
5 An account of Gḥiyas-ud duniyā-wad-dīn Muhammad Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh	223
6 An account of the reign of Sultān Qutb-ud dīn Ahmad Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh, son of Muzaffar Shāh	226
7 An account of Sultān Dāūd Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh, son of Muzaffar Shāh	235
8 An account of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh	237
9 An account of Sultān Muzaffar Shāh, son of Mahmūd Shāh	292
10 An account of Sultān Sikandar, son of Sultān Muzaffar Shāh	323
11 An account of Nasir <u>Khān</u> entitled Sultān Mahmūd, son of Sultān Muzaffar	328
12 An account of the accession of Sultān Bahādur Shāh	333
13 A narrative of Mirān Muhammad Shāh, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr	381
14 An account of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, son of Latif <u>Khān</u> , son of Muzaffar Shāh	383
15 An account of Sultān Ahmad	394
16 An account of Sultān Muzaffar, son of Sultān Mahmūd, son of Latif <u>Khān</u>	397
SECTION VI THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF BANGĀLA	414
1 An account of Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn	419
2 An account of the reign of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn	420
3 An account of Hājī Ilyās, who had the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn <i>Bhangara</i>	421
4 An account of the rule of Sultān Sikandar Shāh, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn	424

	PAGE
5 An account of Sultan Ghiyas ud din	427
6 An account of Sultan us salatin	429
7 An account of Sultan Shams ud din	429
8 An account of Raja Kans	430
9 An account of Sultan Jalal ud din son of Kans	431
10 An account of Sultan Ahmad son of Sultan Jalal ud din	433
11 An account of Nasir the slave	434
12 An account of Nasir Shah	434
13 An account of Barbak Shah	435
14 An account of Yusuf Shah	436
15 An account of Sikandar Shah	436
16 An account of Fath Shah	437
17 An account of Barbak Shah	438
18 An account of Firuz Shah	439
19 An account of Mahmud Shah	440
20 An account of Muzaffar Shah Habshi	441
21 An account of Sultan Ala ud din	442
22 An account of Nasir Shah	444
SECTION VII THE SECTION ABOUT THE SHARQI SULTANS	446
1 An account of Sultan ush sharq	447
2 An account of Mubarak Shah Sharqi	448
3 An account of Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi	449
4 An account of Sultan Mahmud son of Ibrahim Sharqi	453
5 An account of Sultan Mahmud Shah son of Mahmud Shah	459
6 An account of Sultan Humam son of Mahmud Shah	459
(PART II)	
SECTION VIII THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTANS OF MALWA	465
1 An account of Dilawar Khan Ghuri	467
2 An account of Sultan Hushang son of Dilawar Khan	468
3 An account of Muhammad Shah son of Hushang Shah Ghuri	491
4 An account of Sultan Mahmud Khalji	497
5 An account of Sultan Ghiyath ud din son of Sultan Mahmud Khalji	543
6 An account of Sultan Nasir ud din	553
7 An account of Sultan Mahmud Shah son of Nasir Shah	554
8 An account of the rule of Sultan Bahadur	615
9 An account of the rule of the deputies of His Majesty Jinnat Ashram Muhammad Humayun Badshah	616
10 An account of Mallu Khan Qadir Shah	617
11 An account of Shuja Khan	621
12 An account of Baz Bahadur son of Shuja Khan	628
SECTION IX THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTANS OF KASHMIR	632
1 An account of Sultan Shams ud din	636
2 An account of Sultan Jamshid son of Sultan Shams ud din	637
3 An account of Sultan Ala ud din	639

	PAGE
4 An account of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn	640
5 An account of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, son of Shams-ud-dīn	642
6 An account of Sultān Sikandar, the Iconoclast, the son of Qutb-ud dīn, the son of Shams-ud-dīn, who had the name of Sikār	644
7 An account of Sultān 'Alī Shāh, son of Sultān Sikandar Butshikan, who had the name of Mirān <u>Khān</u>	650
8 An account of Sultān Zain-ul-'Ābidīn, son of Sultān Sikandar Butshikan, which is another name for Shāhī <u>Khān</u>	652
9 An account of Sultān Haider Shāh son of Sultān Zain-ul-'Ābidīn, who had the name of Hājī <u>Khān</u>	672
10 An account of Sultān Hasan, son of Hājī <u>Khān</u> Haider Shāh	675
11 An account of Sultān Muhammad Shāh, son of Sultān Hasan Shāh	682
12 An account of Sultān Fath Shāh, which is another name for Fath <u>Khān</u>	689
13 An account of Sultān Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh	696
14 An account of Nāzuk Shāh, son of Fath Shāh	698
15 An account of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, son of Sultān Muhammad Shāh	706
16 An account of the rule of Mīrzā Haider	707
17 An account of Nāzuk Shāh	719
18 An account of Ibrāhīm Shāh, son of Muhammad Shāh, who was the brother of Nāzuk Shāh	725
19 An account of Ismā'il Shāh, brother of Ibrāhīm Shāh	729
20 An account of Habīb Shāh, son of Ismā'il Shāh	730
21 An account of the rule of Ghāzī <u>Khān</u>	737
22 An account of Husain <u>Khān</u> , brother of Ghāzī <u>Khān</u>	740
23 An account of 'Alī Shāh, brother of Husain	747
24 An account of Yūsuf <u>Khān</u> , son of 'Alī Shāh	752
SECTION X THE SECTION ABOUT THE RULERS OF SIND	761
1 An account of the Government of Jām Ānar	773
2 Jām Jūnān	773
3 An account of Jām Malitha, son of Jām Ānar	774
4 An account of the Government of Jām Tamāchī	774
5 Jām Ṣalāh-ud-dīn	775
6 Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, son of Ṣalāh-ud-dīn	775
7 Jām 'Alī Shēr	775
8 Jām Karn, son of Jām Tamāchī	776
9 Jām Fath <u>Khān</u> , son of Sikandar <u>Khān</u>	776
10 Jām Tughlaq, son of Sikandar <u>Khān</u>	777
11 Jām Mubārak	777
12 Jām Iskandar, son of Jām Fath <u>Khān</u> , son of Sikandar <u>Khān</u>	777
13 Jām Sanjar	778
14 Jām Nizām-ud dīn, who is known as Jām Nandā	778
15 An account of the Government of Jām Fīrūz	779
16 An account of Shāh Bēg Arghūn	781

	PAGE
17 An account of Shah Husain	783
18 An account of Mirza Isa Tarkhan	784
19 An account of Mirza Muhammad Baqi son of Mirza Isa Tarkhan	785
20 An account of Mirza Jani Bēg	786
21 An account of Sultan Mahmud	786
SECTION VI AN ACCOUNT OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SULTANS OF MULTAN	787
1 An account of Shaikh Yusuf	788
An account of Sultan Qutb ud din Lankah	790
3 An account of Sultan Husain son of Sultan Qutb ud din	791
4 An account of Sultan Firuz	798
5 An account of Sultan Mahmud son of Sultan Firuz	800
6 An account of Sultan Husain son of Sultan Mahmud	806
BIBLIOGRAPHY	813
(PART III)	
INDEX	817

PREFACE

The late Mr Bṛajendranāth De as a result of sustained work for nearly 20 years prepared a collated edition of the text of the *Tabaqāt i Akbarī* of Khwajāh Nizām ud dīn Aḥmad. The first half of the first volume of the text was issued in July 1911 and the final or third volume was completed after Mr De's death on 28th September 1932 by Khan Bahadur M Hidayat Hosain from his manuscript and issued in July 1935. The first two volumes of the English translation by the same author were issued in 1927 and 1936 respectively. The first 80 pages in page proof and an unrevised and partly incomplete translation of the remainder of the third volume was found amongst Mr De's papers and the Council of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal recently requested the undersigned to edit and complete the work. It was hoped that the undersigned would have the collaboration of Prof M Mahfūz ul Haqq in this work but this has not been possible and for the work as now issued the entire responsibility must rest with the undersigned. The first 80 pages were printed as corrected and revised by Mr De and in the remainder the work of Mr De has as far as possible been preserved. The undersigned has however to prevent errors and omissions verified the entire translation and checked citations and references as far as possible. Further as no standard scheme of transliteration had been followed it was thought desirable to follow a slightly modified form of the scheme adopted by the International Oriental Congress of 1894 for the transliteration of Arabic and Persian works.

In view of the size of the publication it was decided to issue the translation in two parts. The first part is now being issued and the second part with a detailed preface and comprehensive indices to both the parts will, it is hoped be ready for issue sometime during the year

Museum House Calcutta
12th July 1939

BAINI PRASHAD

TABAQĀT-I-AKBARĪ

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

(VOLUME III)

SECTION I THE SULTĀNS OF THE DAKIN TWENTY NINE PERSONS

THE ¹ DAKINI SECTION 29 PERSONS AND THE PERIOD OF THEIR
RULE BEGAN WITH THE YEAR 748 A H AND ENDED IN 1002 A H AND
LASTED FOR 254 YEARS

Historians are agreed that when the sun of the greatness of
Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq Shah passed from its zenith and
declined towards its setting there were troubles in all parts of his
kingdom the hearts of his soldiers became averse to obedience
and many rebellions were brought forth from the womb of time
The real cause of the occurrence of these rebellions was this that the
Sultan entrusted great works to men of mean and evil nature
² These men under the influence of their greed and avarice under
took difficult tasks and ³ laid unreputable deeds on the ground
As their determinations did not bear fruit they became annoyed
with men who had any marks of greatness and caused sorrow to the
latter

Couplet

⁴ To exalt the heads of the unworthy
To hope for good from any of them

¹ The lith ed has *طبعه سلاطین دکن* which is better

This is the period mentioned in the MSS as well as in the lith ed The
Bahmani kingdom however only lasted for about a century and a half The
Cambridge History of India has a list of 18 Sultāns whose reigns extended from
49 A H (131 A D) to 934 A H (1577 A D)

² The MSS have *ان گروہ*

³ The MSS as well as the lith ed have *و عملهای عمر مکرر بر زمین نهاد*
the meaning of which is not at all clear

⁴ The first four lines were quoted in connection with the employment of
base and unworthy men in the History of Muhammad Tughlaq Shah see page

Is utterly to lose the thread of thy actions,
 And is like a snake, in thy pocket, to keep
 As on the worthless, thou placest charges great
 Know that from salt land thou hop'st for fruit

Among the most important incidents was that of 'Azīz Kham-mār, on account of whom the *amīrs Sadhā* (*amīrs* of hundreds) of Gujrat rose in rebellion and the whole country became full of disturbances and rebellion. Sultān Muhammad advanced towards Gujrat in order to put them down. He sent Malik Lājīn (Lāchīn) to summon the *amīrs* of hundreds of Daultābād. As the pardoning of offences, and patience were not ingrained in the creed of the Sultān, the *amīrs* of hundreds being frightened of their awe of him, and of the wrath of his greatness slew Malik Lājīn on the way and going to Daulatābād seized all the property, and wealth which were in Dhāiāgarh, and having blown up the dust of disturbance, raised the standard of rebellion. The details of this brief statement, have been written down in their proper places by this pen of broken writing.

In the end, during the lifetime of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq,
¹ 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, who is celebrated as Hasan Gāngu, and was one

216, Vol I, Persian text of this work. The appointment of such men and the result of such appointments were fully described in the History of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh.

¹ Compare Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, Vol I, page 37 *et seq.*, where it is stated that "Sultan 'Alla-ud din Hoosein Kango Bahminee" (as the name is written there) "was a man of the name of Zuffir Khan" (Zafar Khān) "who had originally been the slave of a Bramin, an inhabitant of Dehli named Kango, who having discovered his merits, gave him liberty and assisted him, as well as foretold his subsequent fortune. On being raised to empire Zuffir Khan did not forget his protector and appointed him in charge of the treasury, and had the honour of giving the appellation of Bahminee to a dynasty of Patan kings." The year of the accession is there put down as 1347 A.D. See also Elphinstone's History, page 465. Firishtah, in the beginning of his 3rd section about the Sultāns of the Dakin, gives a long account of Hasan, and his gradual rise to power, of his receiving the title of Zafar Khān and finally of his accession. It will be seen that Nizām-ud-dīn omits all mention of the Brahman, who laid the foundation of, and foretold Hasan's fortune, and it will also be seen, that according to him, it was Shaikh Nizām ud dīn Auliyā who first gave indications of his rise to sovereign power. Firishtah mentions the

of the common soldiers of that country raised in concert with a body of low people and adventurers the standard of government in Daulatabad in the Deccan in the year 748 and gave himself the title of Sultan Ala ud din

Sultan Muhammad had no opportunity of putting him down on account of the disturbances in Gujrat and at that very time he died in the neighbourhood of Thatta. The currency of the rule of the Bahmanya Sultans was on such a grand scale from the aforementioned year which was the year of the accession of Sultan Ala ud din Hasan till the year 887 which was the date of the

prophecies of both the Brahman and of Shaikh Nizam ud din Auliya but he does not refer to his alleged descent from Bahman the son of Isfandiar. It is unnecessary here to mention the details but Firishtah's conclusion is that As the name of Kanku or Gangu Brahman (Brahman) became a part of the name of Sultan Ala ud din Hasan he has been called Bahmani but poets and historians who wanted to flatter him having got hold of an argument (دستوری) have shown the matter in a different garb. The Cambridge History of India Vol III p 10 says Hasan's claim to descent from the half mythical hero Bahman son of Isfandiar seemed to mark him out for the honour of royalty. Nizam ud din does in one place say that he made such a claim but according to Firishtah it was poets and historians who manufactured this claim. The Cambridge History of India calls Ala ud din Hasan Shah Bahman Shah and Sir Wolsely Haig in a paper published in the J A S B extra no 1901 gives certain cogent reasons in support of this name. Yet it is curious that if he styled himself Bahman Shah he should have called his capital Hasanabad and not Bahmanabad.

The Cambridge History of India brushes aside Firishtah's story about Kanlu or Gangu Brahman as an absurd legend yet it finds it difficult to explain the name of Kanlu or Gangu which frequently occurs in connection with the names of the Sultans of the dynasty. It is admitted in note 3 on p 10 that the meaning of the addition Kanku has not been established but in p 373 it says that it has been credibly explained by Maulavi Abd ul Wali as a scribe's corruption of Ka kau. I have carefully read the Maulavi's short paper and I must say with all deference to him and to Sir W Haig that the explanation is utterly flimsy. Ka kau was to have the final ک struck off and the ککاو which would be left might be changed to Kaikan Kanlan Kanku Gangu Kaku. How Ka kau (ککاو) can be changed to Kanku (کانکو) or Gangu (گانگو) and why of all the variants the e should have been selected and adopted by historians neither the Maulavi nor Sir W Haig condescend to explain. I may say that even Zia ud din Barani has Hasan Kanku

accession of ¹Muhammad Shāh, and which comes to a period of 139 years, that any increase over it cannot be conceived Hasan Gāngu declared that he was a descendant of Bahman, son of Isfandiyār, and on that account, the attribution of the name of Bahmanya to him and his descendants is not inappropriate ²And from the year 887 A H to the year 935 A H which comes to a period of 148 years, the name of Sultān has been attributed to the descendants of Bahman Shāh But the wretched (*Be Daulat*) Barīd and his descendants had, on account of their evil spirit, kept their sovereign princes in confinement, in their house, and had themselves performed the functions of the sovereign power

The five *amīns*, who had been the principal nobles of the Bahmanya empire, divided the Dakin amongst themselves, and each took possession of his share, and became independent in it

Also in the year 935, 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāvelī having made his submission to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrat, had the *Khutba* (public prayers) read and the *Sikka* (coin) struck in his own territory in the name of Sultān Bahādur After a year Sultān Bahādur marched into the Deccan at the instigation of 'Imād-ul-mulk As Nizām-ul-mulk and the other *amīns* had not the strength to oppose him, they also read the *Khutba* in his name

During that time, Mahk Barīd, son of Barīd, had the helpless Sultān Kalīm-ul-lāh imprisoned in the city of Bīdai In the matter of the fixing of the period of the rules of the Bahmanya Sultāns, different accounts have come under my notice, but as the book (called) *Sirāj-ut-Tawārikh* written by Khwāja Muhammad Lārī during the time of those Sultāns, and from that date till to-day, namely 1002 A H, a period of sixty-seven years, Dakin was governed by four dynasties, *viz*, the descendants of Nizām-ul-mulk called Nizām-ul-mulkiya, the descendants of Adil Khan called Adil Khaniya,

¹ This should, I think, be Mahmūd Shāh, the period from the accession of 'Ala-ud-dīn in 748 A H to that of Mahmūd in 887 A H is 139 years

² The meaning of the following sentences is not at all clear The period is 148 years in one MS But only 48 years in the other and in the lith ed The correct period from the accession of 'Ala-ud dīn to the end of the reign of Kalīm-ul lah, the last Sultān of the dynasty in the year 935 A H which is mentioned in the text, is 186 years The last five Sultāns were puppets in the hands of Barīd and his descendants.

the descendants of Qutb ul mulk called Qutb ul mulkiva and the descendants of Malik Barid called Malik Barid as I will detail later

¹ Sultan Ala ud din Hasan Shah eleven years and ten months and seven days

Sultan Muhammad Shah son of Sultan Ala ud din Hasan Shah
³ eighteen years and seven months

Sultan Mujahid Shah one year and one month and nine days

Sultan Daūd Shah one month and three days

⁴ Sultan Muhammad Shah son of Mahmud Shah nineteen years nine months and twenty four days

⁵ See note

Sultan Shams ud din ⁶ son of Muhammad Shah five months and seven days

Sultan Firuz Shah twenty five years and seven months and eleven days

Sultan Ahmad Shah ⁷ twelve years and nine months and twenty four days

¹ Compare the name and the periods of the reigns of the Bahmani Sultans as given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas These names the note says were taken from Firishtah's History Compare also Cambridge History of India Vol III p 70.

One MS and the lith ed have two months The other MS has ten months The date of his accession is given as August 3rd 1347 The date of his death according to Firishtah is 1st Rabi ul Awwal 959 A H 2nd February 1358 There is one coin of his of 100 A H but it is believed to be posthumous (See note 1 p 10 which gives a summary of the history of the reign as given by Firishtah)

³ Both MSS have eighteen years but the lith ed has thirteen years According to the Cambridge History of India Vol III he reigned from 759 A H 1358 A D to 776 A H 1375 A D

⁴ As to the correctness of this name see note p Firishtah calls him Sultan Mah nud

⁵ In the list given in Grant Duff's History the name of Sultan Ghazee ood deen Shah Bahmani is given as that of the sixth Sultan between Sultan Mahmud Shah and Sultan Shams ud din The correct name is Sultan Chhaya ud din and although it is omitted from the list in the MSS and also in the lith ed a short account of his reign appears in its proper place The name is given in the list in p 70 of the Cambridge History of India Vol III

⁶ One MS has son of Muhammad Shah but the other MSS and the lith ed do not have these words

⁷ One MS and the lith ed have the period as given above in the text but the other MS has و بعد سلط و كما و the period of his reign (was)

¹Sultān Ahmad Ghīyās-ud-dīn Shāh, twelve years, and nine months and twenty-four days

Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn, twenty-three years and nine months and twenty-two days

Sultān Humāyūn Shāh, son of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn, three years and six months and five days

Sultān Nizām Shāh, one year and eleven months and ten days

Sultān Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī, nineteen years and four months and fifteen days

Sultān Mahmūd Shāh forty years and two months and three days

Sultān Āhmad Shāh, two years and one month.

Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn, one year and eleven months

Sultān Walī-ul-lah and his brother Kalīm-ul-lah, three years and one month and twenty-seven days

The total period of the rule of the Bahmanī Sultāns, seventeen persons, and one hundred and eighty-seven years and two months

After that, the four *amīrs* having gained their independence, have been ruling with complete independence from that day till this day, which is (in) the year 1002 A H and the 38th year of the Ilāhī era, ² which amounts to a period of sixty-seven years. Up to the present time the Dakin is in their possession. Let it not remain concealed, that the foundation of the rule of the four *amīrs* took place in the year 887 A H and they became completely independent in the year 935 A H

one month and twenty days. According to Firishtah he reigned for twelve years and two months, and according to the Cambridge History of India from 825 A H, 1422 A D to 839 A H, 1435 A D

¹ This name occurs in one MS but does not occur in the other and in the lith ed, and it appears from the history of the reigns, that there was no Sultān of this name. Apparently the name of Sultān Ghīyās-ud-dīn which was omitted from its proper place was inserted here by mistake, with Ahmad prefixed to it

² The text is according to the reading in the MSS but the lith ed has حکومت دکن در تصرف آنها است، سی و هشت سال القاب و نام سلطنت بر او و اولاد حکومت دکن در تصرف آنها است، سی و هشت سال القاب و نام سلطنت بر او و اولاد، i.e., the rule of the Dakin was in their hands but they had for thirty-eight years the titles and the name of sovereignty in the Bahmanī dynasty

The Nizam ul Mulkiyahs

Nizam ul mulk Bahri

Ahmad Nizam ul mulk four years

Burhan Nizam ul mulk forty eight years

Hasan Nizam ul mulk thirteen years

¹ Murtaza Nizam ul mulk twenty six years

- Hasan Nizam ul mulk son of Murtaza two months

Husain Nizam ul mulk two years

Murtaza Nizam ul mulk who is at present the ruler two year

The Ādil Khaniyas

² Yusuf Ādil Khān seven years

Isma'il Ādil Khān twenty five years

⁴ Ibrahim Ādil Khān twenty five years

Ali Ādil Khān, twenty five years

Ibrahim Ādil Khān fourteen years

The Qutb ul mulkiyahs

⁵ Sultan Ali Qutb ul mulk twenty four years

⁶ Ahmad Qutb ul mulk seven years

Ibrahim Qutb ul mulk thirty five years

Muhammad Quli Qutb ul mulk ⁷ thirty eight years

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF ALA UD DIN HASAN SHĀH

The chroniclers of events have narrated that Ala ud din Hasan Bahamani who is celebrated as Hasan Gangu came to the capital city of Dehli according to the vicissitudes of time in the reign of

¹ The text is according to one MS and the lith ed but the other MS has Isma'il Nizam ul mulk

The text is according to one MS and the lith ed but the other MS has Burhan Nizam ul mulk instead of Hasan Nizam ul mulk.

² The name is Yusuf in one MS and in the lith ed but it is Isma'il in the other MS

⁴ According to one MS and the lith ed Ali Ādil Khān comes between the two Ibrahims but according to the other MS he precedes them and one Ibrahim succeeds the other

⁵ His name occurs in one MS but is omitted from the other MS

⁶ He is Ahmad in one MS Jamshid in the other and has no name in the lith ed but is simply called قطب الملك

⁷ One MS and the lith ed have thirty eight years but the other MS has thirty five years

Sultān ¹Tughlaq Shāh One day the Polestar of all those who have known God Shaikh Nizām-ud-dīn Dehlavī had issued a general invitation and Sultān Muhammad and all the great men were present When the table cloth was removed and Sultān Muhammad took his leave, the Shaikh said to an attendant, "One Sultān is gone and another is at the door go, bring him" The attendant went outside He saw Hasan Gāngu at the door He took him to wait on the Shaikh Hasan, in the purity of his faith, placed his head of exaltation on the foot of the Shaikh and expressed his devotion The Shaikh placed a round piece of bread on his finger, and gave it to Hasan The bread and the Shaikh's finger took the shape of an umbiella So that all who were present and Hasan came to know the glad tidings given by the Shaikh Hasan in great pleasure and joy went out of the presence of the Shaikh and accepting the joyful news, turned towards the Dakin, in concert with a body of Afghāns When they arrived there, at that time there were disturbances in that country. Hasan Gāngu killed the ²Superintendent of the city of Gulbarga, and took possession of the neighbouring tract of country From there, he went to Daulatābād, in concert with the *Mīrān-Sadhā* (the chiefs of the hundreds) 'Alam-ul-mulk, brother of Qutlagh Khān shut himself up in Daulatābād As Hasan was under obligations to Qutlagh Khān, he gave safe conduct to 'Alam-ul-mulk, but took possession of the property belonging to Muhammad Shāh, which was in Dhārāgarh Then in concert with the soldiers, he placed an Afghān of the name of ³Isma'il Fath on the throne of sovereignty, with the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn

¹ One MS has Sultan Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, but the other and the lith ed omit Muhammad

² There are slight variations in the readings One MS has میران سادات گلبرگہ را کشت, while the other has گلبرگہ را کست The lith ed has سادات گلبرگہ را کست It appears from Firishtah that Hasan Gangu had already assumed the title of Zafar Khān, and had become well known (احتمالاً نامتہ) in Bakri and Rāibagh and Mirich and Kalhar Hasanābād Gulbarga and killed Bharūn Rāy, the governor of the fort of Gulbarga, who was one of the trusted servants of Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh

³ According to Firishtah Isma'il Fath was an *amīr i du-hazāri* (an *amīr* of two thousand horse), but Col Briggs says "an officer of one thousand horse",

When this news reached Sultan Muhammad he started from Bahroj for Daulatabad in order to have his revenge. The rebels fought with him and were defeated. Isma'il Afghan crept into the fort of Dharagarh (Daulatabad?) and Hasan marched away towards Gulbarga. Sultan Muhammad Shah halted at Dharagarh for some days. At this time scouts brought the news that Taghi a slave of Safdar ul mulk had revolted in the neighbourhood of Nahrwala Pattan had taken possession of that place and was besieging the fort of Bahroj.³ Muhammad Shah nominated Imad ul mulk for overthrowing Hasan and left some of the *amirs* round the fort of Dharagarh and himself marched towards Cujrat. Haan by such 'machinations' as he could employ defeated and slew

and he was also the younger brother of Malik Gul Afghān (Col Briggs calls him Malick Moolah) who was one of the great nobles of Sultan Muhammad Taghilaq Shāh and had a large army for the defence of Malwa who would if it became necessary assist and aid his brother. It does not appear that all the *amirs* of the Dakin agreed to Isma'il Fath's being made the Sultan for Firishah says: 'That all the *amirs* of the Dakin whether they liked it or not (*khawāṣṣ* na *khawāṣṣ*) agreed to make Isma'il Fath Afghān Nāsir ud din Shāh and held the umbrella of sovereignty over his head.' The Cambridge History of India says that the man whom Nizām ud din and Firishah call Isma'il Fath has been called Mukh Muih and Iath but it has followed the Bibliotheca Indica text of Barani and called him Isma'il Mukh the Afghān. Barani however calls him only *مخ افغان* which may be translated Makl or Mukh Afghān.

¹ Firishah says that Sultan Muhammad Taghilaq was joined on the way to Daulatabad by Imād ul mulk Tabrizi his son in law and governor of Berar and Malik Gul Afghān and he describes in some detail the varying fortunes of the battle. He also says that after the battle the rebel leaders decided that it would not be advisable to have another drawn battle and that Nāsir ud din should remain at Daulatabad with a sufficient force to defend it and Hasan should remain in possession of Gulbarga with twelve thousand men. Muhammad Taghilaq Shāh besieged Daulatabad and the garrison was reduced to great straits when the news of the revolt of Taghi came from Dehli.

The name is Taghi in the MSS and in Firishah. The lith ed has wrongly *طغر* Zafar.

² One MS has the word Sultan before Muhammad Shāh but the other MS and the lith ed omit it.

³ Firishah does not mention any machination or treachery. He says that Hasan Gangu met Imād ul mulk near Ahmadabad Bidar. For twenty days neither army felt strong enough to attack the other but Ala ud din having

'Imād-ul-mulk He then went to Daulatābād, and placing the umbrella (of sovereignty) over his own head, assumed the title of Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Sultān Muhammad considered the overthrowing of Taghī of primary importance, and did not turn his attention to the suppression of the disturbances in the Dakin And during the course of that year he was united with the Divine mercy in the neighbourhood of Thatha, and the empire was settled on Hasan without a dispute and an enemy He gave the name of Hasanābād to Gulbarga and made it his capital

¹After a time he fell ill, and when he had no hope of living longer, he gave advice and direction to his son, Muhammad Khān,

received reinforcements of fifteen thousand infantry from the Rāy of Telingana, who was aggrieved with Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq, and of five thousand horsemen from Nāsir ud dīn attacked 'Imād ul mulk The battle was well contested and lasted all day In the end victory declared itself for 'Ala ud dīn, and 'Imād-ul mulk was killed

¹ Nizām-ud dīn does not give any account of the events of 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan Shāh's reign It appears from Firishtah that he proclaimed himself as Sultān on Friday, the 24th Rabi'-ul-Ākhar, 748 A H, corresponding with Friday, August 3rd, 1347 A D Firishtah goes on to say that one of his first acts was to send for Gāngu Brāhman, and to place the account office of his kingdom (*daftar-i muhāsibā-i-mumālīk Mabrūsa-i khud*) in his charge He also combined the name of the Brāhman with his own by styling himself, "the smallest of the slaves of the holy Presence 'Ala-ud dīn Hasan Gāngu Bahmanī" He brought the neighbouring territories under his rule, took possession of the fort of Bidar and Kand'har from the officers who were in charge of them under Sultān Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh by peaceful means, and restored the Jāma'Masjid and the fort of Gulbarga which had become dilapidated Then he heard of the death of Muhammad Tughlaq Shāh, and becoming assured of there being no further danger from him set about to make his rule permanent He married his son to the daughter of Malik Saif-ud dīn (Ghūrī with great pomp It appeared that when the marriage festivities were going on, his wife expressed her sorrow that at such a time, her sister, the aunt of the prince, could not be present The Sultān inquired where she was, and found that she was in Multan, so without telling her anything he sent men to bring the lady, and protracted the marriage festivities for seven months, till the old lady was brought, in a *dul*, to the great joy and surprise of the queen

After the marriage festivities were over, Isma'il Fath, who had at one time been raised to the throne as Nāsir ud-dīn Shāh, but had afterwards been made *amīr-ul-umra* and *sipah-sālār* became disaffected, because Saif ud-dīn Ghūrī was given precedence over him 'Ala-ud dīn put him to death, but as he had

and accepted the summons of death. The period of his reign was eleven years and two months and seven days.

Verse

No one doth live in this garden for aye
 Each one for a moment doth in it play
 In it each moment a new fruit doth grow
 One goes away and another arrives

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTAN MUHAMMAD SHAH
 SON OF ALA UD DIN HASAN SHAH

When the term of rule came to Muhammad Khan he sat in the place of his father and assumed the title of Sultan Muhammad Shah.

promised did not punish any of those whom he had got to enter into a conspiracy with him and also did not punish his son or any other relation of his but maintained them in their rank and position. The Ray of Tilang who had before this been inclined to be refractory now became submissive and sent the tribute which he had formerly sent to Dehli. Ala ud din then made most grandiose proposals for the conquest of all the surrounding country but later modified them on the advice of Malik Saif ud din Ghuri. He sent an army to the Karnatik which looted and devastated the country and brought immense quantities of booty and tribute. He also extended his territory as far south as the Tungabhadra. He then started for Malwa and Gujrat and sent Shahzada Muhammad with twenty thousand horsemen in advance. When the prince arrived at the town of Nausari he found the forests full of wild animals and began to hunt them. He also sent information to his father and the latter went and joined in the hunt. There he had fever in spite of which he indulged in wine and *labāb* of the meat of the animals killed. He became seriously ill and returned quickly to Gulbarga. There he obtained absolution from the hand of the Sadr ush shari'f Samarqandi and then divided his kingdom into four parts and placed them in charge of four nobles. He reigned for six months during which time he occupied himself in doing justice to the poor and oppressed among the people. He also ordered the release of all convicts except six about whom he left directions with his son. He died on the 1st Rab ul Awwal 798 A.H. corresponding with the 2nd February 1398. The Burhān-i-masir gives 761 as the year of his death and says he reigned for thirteen years ten months and twenty seven days but these figures are not accurate.

¹ Firishtah's account of the reign of Muhammad Shah contains a lot of matter which have not been referred to at all by Nizam ud din and I consider it unnecessary to mention it here. It appears however that the gold and silver coins of the Bahmani Sultans were being melted down in large quantities

He was a young man, adorned with (a sense of) justice and equity. The people were happy and contented during the period of his rule,

by the Hindus of Bijānagar (Vijayanagar) and Warangal, and numbers of the Hindu merchants were put to death to put down this practice. In connection with the conquest of "Bilampatan", it appears however that Sultān Muhammad sent much treasure to Mecca and Medina with his mother. This gave rise to some dissatisfaction among the nobles, and the Rāy of Bijānagar coming to know of this, sent ambassadors, demanding that all the territories as far as the river Krishna and all the forts and parganas in it should be left in his possession. The Rāy of Tilang, who had ceded Kūlās as a tribute to Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan, also at this time sent ambassadors with the message that his son Nāgdeo had rebelled against him, and was demanding the recovery of the fort of Kūlās, and it was advisable that Sultān Muhammad should restore it to him instead of having recourse to warfare. Sultān Muhammad kept the ambassadors on various pretexts, in his capital, for a year and half, and during that time he destroyed all the *amīrs*, about whom he had any suspicion, and collected those who were loyal to him. He then sent for the ambassadors at a great *maḥlis* and directed them to write at once to their masters to send elephants loaded with gold and gems and other presents to the Sultān. The ambassadors sent reports to their masters. When the Rāys of Bijānagar and Tilang received these reports, the latter sent his eldest son Nāgdeo (his correct name appears, according to Sewell's "A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar", p. 31, to have been Vināyaka Deva, Col. Briggs calls him Vināik Dew) from Warangal with a large army of infantry and cavalry towards Kūlās and the former sent twenty thousand horse and foot to reinforce Nāgdeo's army. The Sultān sent Bahādur Khān, son of Isma'il Fath, whom he had made his commander-in-chief, with the armies of Bidar and Berar against Nāgdeo. The latter was defeated and his army fled. Bahādur Khān pursued him as far as Warangal, and returned with much booty.

Then one day, towards the end of the year, when the Sultān was seated on a *kursi* (chair?) and making his ablutions, it was reported to him that some merchants had brought horses for sale. The Sultān at once sent for them and inspected the horses, but found that they were not good enough for his use. On asking the merchants, they said that they were bringing fine horses for the Sultān, but Nāgdeo who was at "Wailampatan" as deputy of his father had taken the horses intended for the Sultān, in spite of their protests. The Sultān was greatly annoyed, and immediately mounted a horse and went out of the city. He stayed there for ten days apparently to collect the forces, and then started on his march. When he arrived at Wailampatan he sent a body of Afghāns in the guise of merchants. They went to the gate, and complained that they had been attacked by robbers, and their merchandise had been looted. While they were thus engaged, the Sultān came to the gate and entered the

and the country of Dakin became on account of the peace (which it enjoyed) and the gathering together of the great men the envy of all the country of Hindustan and there was a fresh splendour in the affairs of the state. Applying all his energies to the conquest of territory and the reviving of the customs of religious warfare (jihad) he in the spring time of his reign and in the beginning of his grandeur collected a well equipped army and started for Bilampatan and in the course of the march he seized many villages and towns

city and his soldiers put every one they met to the sword. Nagdeo fled to the citadel and attempted to defend it but it was soon taken. When Nagdeo was brought before the Sultan the latter asked him why he had taken the horses intended for him he was so frightened that he gave a harsh reply. The Sultan who was inclined to be merciful and wanted to pardon him became enraged and had his tongue cut out and ordered him to be burnt alive. He then passed fifteen days in the city in the enjoyment of much pleasure.

I have endeavoured to compress about three quarto pages of lithograph in the above note. Firishtah's language appears to me to be harsh and cruel. He says for example that the burning alive of Nagdeo was *سنانس که لا نکار بدی است*

I have not been able to identify Bilampatan or Wailampatan. Culbarga and Warangan and Cullian or Kallan which last is mentioned by Firishtah as having been passed by the Sultan on his march to Bilampatan are in the map. It appears from Mr Sewell's *A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar* p 31 that Villumpattan which according to Mr Sewell is how the name as given by Firishtah should be spelled and Filampatan according to the author of the *Burhān Ma'asir* was the city (capital) of the Raya of Warangal. Mr Sewell does not mention the story of the horses but according to him apparently Muhammad reached the capital of Warangal in the first expedition. The Sultan commanded a pile of wood to be lighted before the citadel and putting Nagdeo in an engine (catapult) had him shot from the walls into the flames in which he was consumed.

Mr Sewell as far as I can see makes no attempt to identify Wailampatan. In a note on page 30 Vol II of his *Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India* Col Briggs however makes such an attempt. He says he knows of no place of this name (Wailampatan). Vilum Conda or Bellum Conda (the sugar hull) was the seat of government of a powerful Raja nearly two centuries afterwards and perhaps Bellum Conda ought to be the true reading. The terminations of pattan (town) and conda (a hill) being frequently used synonymously if the town be under a hill as it does in this case. One principal objection to this surmise however arises from the towns of Hawlās and Kallan which are here mentioned not lying on the nearest road between Koolbarga and Bellumconda.

belonging to the enemy and included them in his own kingdom. The Rāy of that country being proud of the strength of his fort, shut its gates on himself. The *amīns* and soldiers having arranged the necessary appliances for the conquest of the fort, commenced hostilities and with Divine help and heavenly aid, seized the citadel, and carried out the practices of slaughter and taking prisoner. After this victory the Sultān made arrangements for the government of that neighbourhood and returned to Gulbarga, and having arranged a great festival, granted to every one a share from the board of his benefactions.

It so happened that one day a messenger came from ¹ Badhūl and reported to the Sultān that the Rāy of Bijānagar had come

¹ The readings are different. One MS has *ار دھول رسیده*, coming or arriving from Badhūl. The other MS has *ار دھول رسدہ* coming from Dhūl, but in the next line we have *بر ولایت دھول* on the country of Badhūl. So that *دھول* Badhūl appears to be the correct reading. The lith ed has *دھولپور رسدہ*, having arrived at Dhūlpūr. This is clearly incorrect. I cannot find any place called Badhūl in a map. There is a place called Mudhal to the south of the river Krishna about half way between Bijānagar or Vijayanagar and Gulbarga or Koolbarga, but a long way to the west of the line connecting them, which may be the place. I cannot find any mention of the place in Firishtah, but there is a story there about Sultān Muhammad having sent an order (*Baiāt*) for the payment of certain musicians to the Rāya of Bijānagar. I cannot understand the meaning of this proceeding unless it was meant to be an insult for provoking hostilities. The order was given, according to Mulla Dāūd of Bidar, who was seal bearer to Sultān Muhammad (as quoted by Mr Sewell, page 33) in a festive assembly, "when the spring of the garden of mirth has infused the cheek of Muhammad Shāh with the rosy tinge of delight, or to use somewhat less romantic language, when he was flushed with wine. The order was so extraordinary that the minister hesitated to despatch it. The Sultān however penetrated his thoughts and compelled the minister to send it.

The Rāya who was proud of his power became angry, and paraded the man, who carried the order, mounted on a donkey all round the city of Bijānagar and immediately collected thirty thousand horse and nine hundred thousand foot soldiers and three thousand elephants for the conquest of the Bahmani kingdom. He established a camp in front of *اودنی* Ūdnī (Adonī in the map). Sultān Muhammad ordered the army of Daulatābad to assemble (those of Bidar and Berar being exhausted with the campaign against Tilang) and after proper religious observances set out to oppose the Rāya of Bijānagar. The latter

by rapid marches, with a large body of horse and foot to the country of Badhul and had seized the fort and made martyrs of the Mussalmans

being assured of safety owing to the Krishna being in flood was engaged in besieging the fort of Mudkal (Madgall in the map N W of Adoni) The fort was at last taken and all the garrison was put to the sword except one man who concealed himself and who escaping from the fort and crossing the Krishna went and gave information to Muhammad Shah at Hasanabad Gulbarga I have stated in an early part of this note that Badhul may be identical with Mudhal but from the context of both the Tabaqat and Firishtah Mudkal is more likely to be identical with Badhul

Firishtah's account of the conquest of Mudkal is different from that of Nizam ud din Firishtah begins his account by saying that Sultan Muhammad on hearing what the fugitive had to say ordered the poor man to be put to death the reason given by him being that he could not bear the sight of a man who has seen the death of so many men He started at once and when he reached the bank of the Krishna after some bragging about his own greatness he said that he was not afraid of the river in flood or of the grandeur and might of the infidel army He sent back his son who afterwards became Mujahid Shah to Gulbarga making him his heir and with only twenty elephants and nine thousand horsemen he crossed the river in the course of three days The Ray in spite of his having such an immense army was so astounded and perplexed by the Sultan's crossing the river that he sent back all his troops in the darkness of the night and remained *jarida* (alone or with a small retinue) so that he might decide in the morning whether he would fight or not When the news of the retreat of the Ray's army became known in the Sultan's camp he left it and everything behind and with horse and whip started for the enemy who fled at once leaving everything behind When the Sultan arrived at the Ray's camp he gave an order for a general massacre and seventy thousand persons men and women and young and old and slaves and free men were put to the sword He passed the rainy season in Mudkal and having received reinforcements started towards the fort of Adoni (Adoni) Firishtah has a great deal more about further conquests in Bijanagar but as there is no reference to them in the Tabaqat I refrain from noting them But it may be briefly stated that the Sultan seized Adoni and after much more fighting and much more slaughter of Hindus in which neither women nor babes at their mothers breast escaped laid siege to Bijanagar itself but although he tried his best for about a month he was unsuccessful He then had recourse to the stratagem which according to Nizam ud din he had used at the time of the siege of Badhul or Mudkal He threw himself on the bed of weakness and the commanders of his army conducted it back across the Tumhandra (Tungabhadra) river and arrived on a level plain where they halted Kishan Ray the Ray of Bijanagar who is however called Bukha I in Sewell's *A Forgotten Empire*

there. Immediately on hearing this, the Sultān collected an immense army, and set forth to punish the Rāy. The latter on receiving information of the vast multitude of the Sultān's army, fled and took shelter in a strong fort. The Sultān sat down round the fort for some days, but when he saw that by doing so, the hand of his hope would not reach the skirt of success, he made an invalid of himself (i.e. pretended that he had fallen ill) and returned towards Gulbarga. When he had crossed the Krishna the Rāy opened the gates of the fort, and gave his men leave to go to their respective places. The Sultān, making Divine help the vanguard of his army, made a rapid march of eighty-one *larohs*, and presented himself in the neighbourhood of the fort and with great activity and smartness fought with and defeated the Rāy, and much booty, in which were included eight thousand prisoners, fell into his hands. The Sultān then returned to Gulbarga crowned with prosperity and success, and made the people happy by his benefactions.

A long time had not elapsed after this, that swift messengers brought the news that ¹ Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy had placed

also encamped at a distance of three or four *larohs*. The Sultān then convened a *maylis*, but still feigning illness left it early. He then sent for his commanders in secret, and ordered them to array the army for battle. At midnight he joined the army, and advanced towards the Bijānagar camp, where the Rāy and his commanders, presuming on the Sultān's illness were engaged in drinking and looking at the dancing of Nautch-girls. When they became aware of the Sultān's approach, they were completely helpless, and the Rāy fled, and did not draw rein till he arrived at Bijānagar. There the people reviled and reproached him, and he at their instance sent emissaries to the Sultān to sue for peace. The latter was at first unwilling to grant their request, but demanded that his original demand for the payment of the musicians should be complied with. The emissaries at once agreed, and in fact there and then paid the amount. Then at the request of the emissaries, the Sultān said that hereafter he would never order the massacre of prisoners and the general slaughter of the people. After this he returned to his capital.

¹ Nizām-ud-dīn does not say anything about the cause of the rebellion of Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy, but it appears from Firishtah, that owing to the Sultān's having feigned to have fallen ill, before Bijānagar, the report of his death became published all over the kingdom, and there being no leading men in the country of Daulatābād, the leaders of the army being at Bijānagar, Bahrām Khān Māzandarānī whom Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn Hasan had given the

their feet outside the bounds of the road of obedience and had scratched the face of loyalty and devotion with the finger nails of hostility. Upon this he started by successive marches towards Deogarh and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of that place fear came in the hearts of Bahram Khan and Govind Ray and they immediately went to Shaikh Rukn ud din who was one of the great Shaikhs of the age and behaved with great meekness and humility.

name of son and Kumbh Deo Marhata sardar rose in revolt. The Govind Ray of the Tabaqat may be the Kumbh Deo of Firishtah and in fact Col Briggs calls him Govind Deo Maratta. The Cambridge History of India Vol III p 382 calls him Kondba Deva. Deva is pure Sanskrit but I do not know what Kondba is. I should think that Kumbha Deva or Govinda Deva more likely to be correct than Kondba Deva. According to the Cambridge History of India Bahram Khan resented the succession of Muhammad and invited Firiz Tughlaq to recover the Deccan and although he failed in this he now rose in rebellion as he felt stronger owing to Muhammad's armies being engaged in the south. There is no mention in the Cambridge History of any intercession by any pious Shaikh. On the approach of Muhammad the rebels dispersed and fled and were pursued to the frontiers of Gujrat where they took shelter. Firishtah's account of the rebellion is much longer and more elaborate and the end is also different. The Shaikh to whom the rebels went is there named Zain ud din (Col Briggs calls him Shaikh Enooddeen) and not Rukn ud din and he did not intercede with the Sultan for their pardon but told them to escape to Gujrat and they went there. The Sultan pursued them but being unable to seize them returned to Daulatabad in great anger. He then sent word to the Shaikh with whom he was already angry because he had not made his submission to him like the other Shaikhs at the time of his accession because he drank intoxicating liquors and did other things not allowed by the law of the Prophet either to appear before him or to send a writing containing his submission. The Shaikh refused to do either. Then the Sultan ordered him to leave the city. The Shaikh taking up his few belongings went and sat down at the *roua* (tomb) of Shaikh Burhan ud din and challenged all and sundry to move him from the place if they dared. The Sultan now became repentant and he and the Shaikh exchanged civilities and the Sultan went back to Gulbarga after receiving the title of *Chāzi* from the Shaikh. Firishtah goes on to say that after this the Sultan shut up all shops for the sale of intoxicants and ordered that all robbers and turbulent people should be put to death and accordingly in the course of six or seven months not one of them was left alive and according to Nulla Daūd Bardari the head of about twenty thousand of them were brought into Gulbarga.

Sultān Muhammad Shāh immediately on arriving at Daulatābād, went to visit the Shaikh. His reverence interceded for the pardon of the offenders, and the Sultān agreed to pardon them, on condition of their immediately leaving his dominions. Bahām Khān and Govind Rāy then went away to Gujāt, hanging down their heads in shame.

After arranging the affairs of that *sūba* the Sultān returned to Gulbaiga. The *amīns* and the great men of the city went forward to welcome him, and made ¹ joy offerings. He remained for a few days in a garden, which was near the gate of the city, and had the bed of pleasure and enjoyment spread there. From that delightful place, he came into the city, and made the Saivads and learned men and the Shaikhs of the city happy by allowing them to partake of his extensive benefactions and of the board of his enjoyment. He also made enquiries and investigations into the condition of the *raiyats* and all helpless people. He redressed with kindness and justice any wrongs that might have been caused to anybody.

² Suddenly the hand of ³ death tore asunder the garment of life on his body, and drew off the robe of life from his soft bosom.

Verses

The world hath to ashes burned many such heaps of grain
Thou shouldst not try to teach tricks to such a magician
old

¹ One MS inserts here *تلا* i.e., praises or applause, the sentence would then be "Greeted him with applause and made joy offerings."

² According to *Firishtah* Sultān Muhammad appears to have lived for several years after his return from Daulatābād, for it is said that every year he went on hunting expeditions to one of the four sides of his dominions and spent three or four months in these excursions. *Firishtah* gives the 9th Zi-qa'ada سنه ست و سبعين و سبعمائه which would be 776, but the year is given in figures as 775 and the period of his reign is said to have been 17 years and nine months and five days. Col. Briggs says he died on the 19th Zekada 776 A.H., 21st March, 1375. Mr. Sewell quotes the date given by *Firishtah*, but he makes the English date the 21st April, 1375. He also says that according to the *Burhān i-Ma'āsir* the Sultān died in 775. According to the list in the note on page 40 of Grant Duff's *History of the Mahrattas* he succeeded his father in 1357 and died in 1374 and therefore reigned for 17 years. According to the *Cambridge History of India*, Muhammad Shāh ascended the throne on the 21st March, 1365, and died in the spring or early summer of 1377.

³ One MS substitutes *مات* for *احل*.

Be not secure that this turbulent stream
 Hath forgotten its habit of devouring men
 The period of his reign was eighteen years and seven months

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF MUJAHID SHAH

He was the son of Muhammad Shah After the latter's death he succeeded him He continued to maintain the praiseworthy qualities and the good attributes of the former Sultans He made the supporting and cherishing of his *raiyats* and the giving of justice his special habits and fully maintained generosity and liberality and manliness In the first spring of his reign he marched towards Bijanagar When he crossed the river Krishna some of

¹ It appears from Firishtah that he was nineteen years of age when he ascended the throne

According to Firishtah Mujahid Shah wrote to the Ray of Bijanagar that the territory and the forts between the rivers Krishna and the Tungabhadra were held jointly by them and there were therefore many disputes between them It would therefore be better if the Ray would cede that territory to him The Ray did not agree and said that the whole of the tract had from ancient times belonged to Bijanagar and should be left in his possession Mujahid Shah then collected his army and crossing the Tungabhadra laid siege to Udm (Adoni) He left Safdar *Khān* Sistani to carry on the siege and marched quickly towards *pargana* Kankawati where he was informed that Kishan Ray (according to Mr Sewell his real name was Bukha I) was encamped

The people informed the Sultan of a ferocious and man eating tiger that infested the jungle there and he with only seven companions entered the forest on foot and when the tiger made its appearance he told his companions to do nothing and with his first arrow he shot the animal dead This so frightened Kishan Ray that although he had a large army he fled into the trackless forests (Mr Sewell says the forests in the valley of Sandūr) and the Sultan pursued him for six or seven months Then Kishan Ray and his sons fell ill He said he had been wandering about in the forest because he had thought that the Sultan would fall ill but instead of that he himself had fallen ill He then went to Bijanagar and fortified himself The Sultan left his commanders to carry on the siege of Bijanagar and himself went on to Setban (Setubandha) Ramesar (the site of the bridge built by Rama) and there he repaired a mosque which Sultan Ala ud din *Khalji* had built and demolished the idol temples As regards this see Sewell pp 41 42 and also notes in Briggs History II pp 33- 333

On returning to Bijanagar he seized the city and demolished the great golden temple ornamented with gems Then a great battle took place and

the inhabitants of the country reported to him, that there was a tiger in the neighbouring forests, which was devastating those parts. Mujāhid Shāh went to hunt the animal, and with the strength of his arm killed it. After that, he ravaged a portion of the country of Bijānagar and obtained much booty. Kishan Rāy, who was the

Kishan Rāy was nearly defeated. In the battle he received with a few horse of eighteen thousand horsemen and a body of foot soldiers. In these are the numbers in the battle of Fūlhitth, but Col Briggs has taken the cavalry and a body of infantry. The battle was a great defeat for the Sultan, who was unable completely to conquer the kingdom. He therefore returned his army and came to Ūdnī (Adoni).

When the Sultan was attacking Bijanagar he made Dāūd Khān lead a detachment left with six thousand horse and some infantry to occupy a place called *Dura* or *Sodra*, or the mouth of the defile of Sodra. It appears from Scott that this was the way of approach to the city along a narrow and difficult road, which approached along the valley of the Sandūr or along the valley, which now carries the main road from Bellary to Vijayanagar, between the Sandūr hills, and the hills that surround the latter city. Col Briggs calls the place Dhura Sodra. I now quote from Col Briggs:—On hearing that the engagement began at dawn, and the enemy were not yet defeated, perceiving also that reinforcements were joining them at every instant, he (Dāūd Khān) became alarmed for the safety of the king, and quitting his station joined in the battle, in which he behaved with surprising gallantry. He had three horses killed under him, and was frequently obliged to fight on foot. The king on seeing the standard of Dāūd Khān was far from pleased, but stifled his resentment till victory declared for the faithful. He then called Dāūd Khān before him, and gave him a harsh reprimand for quitting his station.

On arriving at Ūdnī (Adoni) he found that his officers were still besieging it. He also was unable to capture it. So a sort of treaty was concluded and the Sultān continued his journey. At Mudkal he left the army behind, and with four hundred companions went to Raichūr (Rāichore). There he occupied himself with hunting. He sent back Saifdar Khān Sīstānī and Ā'azam Humāyūn Sīstānī to their respective governments of Berar and Daulatābād. Dāūd Khān, who was grieved owing to the Sultān's having abused him (this is also mentioned in the *Tabaqāt*), conspired with Masnad 'Alī Khān Muhammad and Masa'ūd Khān, who had grievances of their own, and Dāūd Khān entered the pavilion in which the Sultān was asleep at night, after he had crossed the river Krishnā, and had been engaged in fishing in the river during the day, and with the help of Masa'ūd Khān slew him. This happened on the 17th Zilhijja, 773, April 4th, 1378. Mr Sewell makes the date April 16th. The period of Sultān Mujāhid's reign did not extend to three years.

leader of the rebels came out of the citadel and surrendered the fort and made submission the stronghold of his honour

¹ At the time of the return scouts brought the news that some turbulent men had taken shelter on the top of a high hill which was in that neighbourhood with much wealth and treasure in their possession. The Sultan marched in that direction and left Daud Khān who was the son of his uncle (i.e. cousin) on the road by which the men would be likely to try to escape and himself engaged in plunder and pillage. After the division of the booty he reprimanded Daud Khān by word of mouth as he found there had been negligence and carelessness on his part in guarding the road of escape of the turbulent men. Daud Khān nourished malice and hostility in his heart conspired with a number of his intimates and when they had all crossed the river Krishna he one night entered the private pavilion of the Sultan and slew him with his dagger. The period of Mujahid Shah's reign was one year and one month and nine days.

A NARRATIVE OF THE REIGN OF DAUD SHAH ² SON OF THE UNCLE OF MUJAHID SHAH

After the assassination of Mujahid Shah ⁴ Daud Khān who was the son of his uncle took his place on the throne of sovereignty and

¹ The real cause of the enmity of Daud Khān and the manner of the assassination and the length of Mujahid Shah's reign are given differently by Firishtah. See the latter part of the last note. According to the list of the Bahmani Sultans given in a note in page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas Mujahid Shah succeeded his father in 1374 and was assassinated by his uncle in 1377 so that he reigned for three years and the period mentioned by Nizam ud din although it is so definite is not correct. According to the Cambridge History of India Vol III also Mujahid Shāh reigned from 1374 to 1379 A.H. 1375 to 1381 A.D. or for about three years. Daud Khān was a son of Sultan Ala ud din Hasan and so he was an uncle of Sultan Mujahid Shah and not a cousin.

See note 1. He was an uncle and not a cousin of Mujahid Shāh.

² See the preceding note.

⁴ There are slight differences in the readings. The new Sultān is called simply Daud in one MS and in the lith ed. In the other MS he is called Daud Khān. I have affixed Khān to his name. Then one MS says he took his seat on the اراكه - مسند الاب. The other MS has اراكه مسند الاب.

the seat of greatness. Most of the *amīrs* and the great men of the country agreed with him. The sister of Mujāhid Shāh bound the girdle of hostility and the belt of enmity, in retaliation of the murder of her brother, and tempted some of the *amīrs* by gifts of money. On a Friday, in the Jāma' Masjid they wounded Dāūd Shāh. He was carried to the palace, while there was still a little breath left in him. Then the brave men of the two parties and the warriors of the opposite sides came out armed and equipped for strife and battle, and in the end the enemy (the party who had assassinated Dāūd Shāh ?) were defeated, and the city was devastated. When the news of this reached Dāūd Shāh, he gave the word of acceptance to the summoner of God. The period of his reign was one month and ¹ three days.

² AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN MUHAMMAD SHĀH,
SON OF MAHMŪD, SON OF BAHMAN SHĀH

The rule of the country of the Dakin was in the grasp of his power for a period of nineteen years. Nothing that may be worthy

اورنگ ایالت و while the lith. ed. has ارایک ایالت only. I have adopted the second reading.

¹ The account of the reign of Dāūd Shāh, as given by Firishtah, does not differ much from that given in the text. Firishtah, however, says, that the *amīrs* did not at first all unite in acknowledging him. There were two parties, one on the side of Dāūd Shāh, while the other was in favour of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh the youngest son of Sultān 'Ala ud-dīn Hasan, but Malik Nāib Saif ud dīn Ghūlī had the public prayers read in the name of Dāūd Shāh, in spite of the opposition of the sister of Mujāhid Shāh, who bore the name of Rūh Parwar Āgha. She persuaded a young man of the name of Bāka, who had been high in the favour of Mujāhid Shāh, on account of his sincerity and bravery, to avenge his patron's murder and he agreed to devote his life in the attempt. On Friday, the 21st of Muharram, 780 A H, May 19th, 1378 A D, he slew Dāūd Shāh in the Jāma' mosque, and was himself cut down by Masnad 'Alī Muhammad Khān. According to Firishtah, Dāūd Shāh reigned for one month and nine days. According to the list in the note on page 40 of Grant Duff's History of the Mahrattas, he reigned for about one month. It is said there also that he was assassinated at the instigation of Roopurwur Agah.

² The history of the reign of Muhammad Shāh, which extended to nineteen years, is given by Nizām-ud-dīn in a few lines. Apparently he knew very little

of mention has come under my notice among the particulars connected with him Towards the end of his life ¹the *thanadar* of

about the history of the reign Even the name is incorrect the correct name according to Firihstah being Sultan Mahmud Shah but see note 2 in page 47 of Sevell's *A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar* from which it would appear that the name on all the coins of this Sultan is Muhammad (Dr Codrington Numismatic Chronicle 3rd series Vol XVIII page 261) and not Mahmūd and this is confirmed by the Buhān i Maasir and two other authorities (Major King in Indian Antiquary July 1899 page 183 note 39) so that after all Nizām ud dīn is right and Firihstah wrong But the Sultān's relationship with the previous Sultan was probably not known to Nizām ud dīn According to Firihstah he was the youngest son of Sultān Ala ud dīn Hasan the founder of the dynasty and Mr Sewell also says that he was Ala ud dīn's youngest son But according to one MS of the Tabaqāt he was the son of Mahmūd son of Bahman Shāh and according to the other he was the son of Mahmūd son of Shāh Bahmanī and according to the lith ed he was the son of Mahmūd son of Husain Shāh The name of Bahman Shah (incorrectly Shāh Bahmanī) supports the statement made by the Cambridge History of India that the founder of the dynasty styled himself Bahman Shah The Husain Shah of the lith ed is of course a mistake for Hasan Shāh As I am not translating Firihstah's history it is not necessary for me to go through the whole of the history of the reign as written by him which extends over nearly three quarto pages of closely printed lithograph I can only refer to such portions of it as will explain the one fact which is mentioned in a very doubtful form at the end of Nizām ud dīn's account

¹ I have taken this from Firihstah The readings in the MSS and in the lith ed are doubtful One MS has بهادر ملے سکر اور باعی بود سد the other has the same reading but omits the word بود which is clearly superfluous and incorrect The lith ed has بهادر ملے دار اور باعی سد What really happened according to Firihstah was that Bahā ud dīn son of Ramzan Daulatabādī became a favourite of the Sultan and was made the Thānadār and governor of the fort of Saghir He had two sons Muhammad and Khwaja who acquired much power and became the object of much envy and malice People complained of them to the Sultan and although he did not believe the accusers Muhammad and Khwaja thinking that they were suspected revolted and forced their father to join them They defeated two armies sent against them A third army was sent under Yusuf Azhdar and in the course of its operations an arm of Muhammad was cut off by Saiyyad Muhammad Kalapahār an officer of the Sultān's army in a single combat Khwaja also came out of the fort and the two brothers remained outside Then the men in the fort sent a message to Yusuf Azhdar to the effect that they would cut off the head of Bahā ud dīn and open one of the gates of the fort and he should

the fort of Sāghir rebelled against him the Sultān marched against him, and defeated him. In the course of the same journey he took the way to the other world. He reigned for a period of nineteen years and nine months and twenty-four days.

¹AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN GHĪYĀS-UD-DĪN

Ghīyās-ud-dīn sat on the *masnad* of sovereignty in the place of his father, on the 7th Rajab and all the *amīns* and the attendants

send a body of chosen men to the gate, when he would be able to capture the fort. In accordance with this plan the fort was seized. The reference to Sāghir or Sāgar as it is called in the Cambridge History of India is brief and, I venture to think slightly confused. It is said there that Muhammad II imprisoned Khān Muhammad, who had been a general in the service of Muhammad I, but who had afterwards been Dāūd's principal supporter, in the fortress of Sāgar, where he shortly afterwards died, and punished his accomplices.

The account of Bahū ud-dīn's rebellion in Sāghir as given in the *Tabaqāt* agrees practically with that given by Firishtah. A short time after this the Sultān died of fever on the 21st Rajab, 799, April 20th, 1396, and his reign extended according to Firishtah to nineteen years, nine months and twenty days. According to the Cambridge History of India, Muhammad II was a man of peace and a lover of poetry and literature. At the instance of the Sadar-i-Jahān Mir 'Ināyetullah of Shīrāz he invited the great poet Hafiz to come to his Court. Hafiz started but he was so alarmed by a storm in the Persian Gulf that he went back to Shīrāz. The Cambridge History of India also says that there was a great famine in the Deccan between 1387 and 1395, and describes the relief measures as displaying a policy of combination.

¹ There is not much difference in the readings in the MSS and in the lith ed. There is also not much difference between the accounts given by Nizām ud dīn and Firishtah. Of course, the latter gives more particulars and details. The name of the Turkī slave, who engineered the transfer of the sovereignty, appears according to Firishtah to have been Taghalchīn. Col Briggs calls him Lallehīn, Mr Sewell does not give his name, but describes him as an ambitious slave. He was dissatisfied, because other nobles had received high dignities and he had been left out in the cold. He had a very beautiful daughter, who was highly skilled in Indian music, and the Sultān was greatly enamoured of her. The latter accepted Taghalchīn's invitation with alacrity, because he expected that his host would offer his daughter as *Peshkash* or tribute, and in the same hope, he ordered all his attendants to leave the place, at the instance of his host. The latter went into the *zenana* as if to bring his daughter, and after a little while, came back with a naked dagger in his

of the Sultan and the commanders of the army placed their heads of fealty on the ground of service. It happened however that a slave of his father of the name of Taghalji who had been honoured by increase of dignity and proximity in rank wanted that the sovereignty should be transferred to another brother (of the Sultan). In order to carry out this resolution he arranged a great feast in the course of which he imprisoned the Sultan and on the 17th of Ramzan 799 A.H. he drew a pencil over his world seeing eyes and raised Sultan Shams ud din on the throne. The period of Sultan Chiyas ud din's rule was one month and twenty days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTAN SHAMS UD DIN BROTHER OF SULTAN CHIYAS UD DIN

As Sultan Shams ud din sat on the *masnad* of sovereignty by the exertions of Taghalji the *amirs* and the great men made their submission to him but the two Shahzadas Iruz Khan and Ahmad

hand. The Sultan who was a lad of seventeen and was more or less intoxicated made a struggle for his life and tried to escape. Taghalchin caught him by the hair of his head and rooted out his eyes with the point of his dagger. He then sent for the nobles and the attendants of Sultan Chiyas ud din on the pretext that the latter was calling for them and as they appeared one by one murdered 24 of them and he then sent for the younger brother of Chiyas ud din who was called Shams ud din and who was a lad fifteen years of age and placed him on the throne. Sultan Chiyas ud din was kept in imprisonment for two months in the fort of Sākir. It does not appear what happened to him after that.

The account of Chiyas ud din's short and tragic reign as given in the Cambridge History of India does not differ materially from that given above. The man who blinded and imprisoned Chiyas ud din is described in it as Taghalchin the chief of the Turkish slaves and the cause of his anger is said to have been Chiyas ud din's refusal to appoint him Governor of Gulburga and lieutenant of the kingdom.

¹ According to Firishtah Sultan Shams ud din was only Sultan in name and all the power was in the hands of Taghalchin who had received the title of *Malik Naib* and the rank of *Amir Jumlagi* or the *amir* in charge of everything.

² These were sons of Sultan Daūd Shāh. The Cambridge History of India says they were sons of Ahmad Khan one of the younger sons of Bahman Shah. According to Firishtah they were only six or seven years of age when their father was killed but Sultan Mahmūd had had them properly trained.

Khān then attempted to regain their hereditary dominion, and commenced to gain the *amīrs* over to their side Sultān Shams-ud-

and had given them his daughters in marriage, and up to the time that he had no sons, had said that he would make prince Firūz his heir Afterwards Sultān Mahmūd directed them to be loyal and faithful to his son and heir, Sultān Ghīyās-ud dīn, but when Taghālchīn blinded and imprisoned Ghīyās-ud-dīn, the wives of the two princes, who were the sisters of the blinded Sultān, incited them to avenge the outrage committed on the latter On the other hand Taghālchīn incited Sultān Shams-ud dīn and the queen mother to seize them Then they fled to Sāghūr, and Sīdhū, the governor of the place, did everything in his power to help them They were still faithful to Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, and wrote to him, telling him that they were not hostile to him, but they only wanted the punishment of Taghālchīn The Sultān, however, incited by Taghālchīn and the queen mother wrote a reply, which could only inflame their enmity They then raised three thousand horse and foot and advanced towards Gulbarga, with the hope that the troops there would come and join them, but when they came to the river Pithora (that appears to be the name in the lith ed of Firishtah, but Col Briggs calls it the river Beema) no one joined them They held a consultation, and afterwards proclaimed Firūz Khān to be the Sultān, and again advanced towards Gulbarga Then there was a battle with Sultān Shams-ud dīn's troops in the neighbourhood of Marqul (Col Briggs calls it Merkole), and Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān were defeated, and retired towards Sāghūr The parties of Taghālchīn and the queen mother became stronger than ever, but the people of Gulbarga were dissatisfied with them, and sent word to Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān that they should get an agreement from Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and come to Gulbarga, and when a suitable opportunity occurred should accomplish their object At this time a '*Divānāh Kashmīrī*' (a Kashmīrī mad man) came from Gulbarga and called Firūz Shāh by the name of Rūz afzūn Shāh and said he would take him to Gulbarga and make him *bādshāh* Taking this to be a happy omen the princes started for Gulbarga and arrived there Both Firūz Khān and Taghālchīn were suspicious and afraid of danger, and took great care of themselves Then on Thursday, the 23rd Safar 800 A H, November 15th, 1397 A D, Firūz Khān entered the *Darbār* attended by twelve *siladūrs* (armed men), and then by a sudden *coup* he imprisoned Shams-ud dīn and Taghālchīn and ascended the *masnad*, and took the title of Sultān Rūz afzūn Sultān Ghīyās-ud-dīn was brought from the fort of Sāghūr, and in spite of his blindness, he slew Taghālchīn who was placed before him, with one blow of his sword Sultān Shams-ud-dīn was blinded and he and his mother were allowed, at their own request, to go to Mecca He is said to have lived there for many years, and during his life time Firūz Shāh made him a liberal allowance of five thousand golden *asharfis* and also

din attempted to seize them and they fled to the fort of Shakar (according to Firishtah Saghir) The *thanadar* there was a slave of the name of Sādhu. He considered the advent of the Shikardis to be a matter of advantage and gratitude and supplied all that they wanted. Firuz Khan then collected troops and advanced for war. Sultan Shams ud din gathered an army and came out of the city. After the troops had been arranged in battle array, Sultan Shams ud din fled and did not halt anywhere till he had gone to the city (Gulbarga). Firuz Khan, owing to the purity of his faith and the goodness of his nature, took the path of peace and procrastination and came to the Sultan. But it became patent after a few days that the Sultan, breaking his agreement with him and his brother Ahmad Khan, wanted to seize them. Then Firuz Khan forestalled him and had three hundred well-armed men concealed in his house under the charge of his brother Ahmad Khan. He himself went to the palace and as he found that the royal seat was unoccupied, he made bold and going up to it sat down on it. As the people were on his side, those who were present in the assembly placed their heads of fealty on the ground of service. About the same time Ahmad Khan arrived there with the three hundred armed men. Those who were on the side of the Sultan (i.e. Shams ud din) left the assembly and dispersed. The Sultan concealed himself but after some days he was seized and according to another statement was slain. The throne of the empire was adorned with the grandeur of the accession of Firuz Shah. The period of the reign of Shams ud din was five months and nine days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTAN FIRUZ SHAH

Sultan Firuz Shah was a *badshah* of great splendour and magnificence and vigour and learning and wisdom. He sat on the throne of grandeur on¹ Thursday the 24th Safar 800 A.H. In the splendid

sent him annually rich clothes. This differs greatly from Nizam ud din's statement that he was imprisoned and according to another statement put to death.

¹ According to Firishtah (see last note) the 3rd Safar was Thursday so the 4th was Friday.

² Nizam ud din is rather vague and indefinite in his laudation of the virtues of Firuz Shāh. Firishtah is more precise. He gives him credit for

period of the days of his rule, the laws of generosity and the customs of truth and honesty and the foundation of justice and equity became stronger. And all sections of the people had peace and comfort under the wings of his justice and beneficence.

Couplet

His justice, by the sword, did clean the page
Of the time, from the signs of falsehood and pain

In difficult affairs and troublesome matters his mind sought the help of those who sat in privacy in corners, praying in humility and tribulation. He himself also in his prostrations and risings prayed for assistance in his victories from the great Holy God. Therefore of a necessity in whichever direction he turned the bridle of his attention, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of his standards.

As all matters connected with his government were properly regulated after his accession, he made the ¹ conquest of Bījānagar the

bravery and activity, and says he was engaged in twenty-four campaigns, for extending his kingdom, and for his generosity, but he says he was addicted to the drinking of wine, to the listening of music and to women. He made excuses, and said that music elevated his soul to the contemplation of God, and wine did not create a disturbance in his mind. As to women, he took the opinions of learned men, and as Mir Fazl-ul-lah Ānjū told him that in the time of the Prophet, *Mutā* (temporary) marriages were allowed, but the Sunnis did not allow them, while the *Inūmias* or *Shiās* did, Firūz Shāh following the *Shiās* received "three hundred females" according to Col Briggs "in one day", but the 11th ed of *Firishtah* says that eight hundred women were introduced into the *harem* in the course of one month. *Firishtah* also says that Firūz Shāh married a princess of the Bījānagar family, and that this was the first time such a marriage took place. The Cambridge History of India says "Firūz at the time of his accession was an amiable, generous, accomplished and tolerant prince, possessed of a vigorous constitution and understanding, both of which he undermined by indulgence in the pleasures of the harem."

¹ *Firishtah* does not mention the rebellion, or of the rebels fortifying themselves in the fort of Shakar or Sāghir, as *Firishtah* calls it, as we have already seen, but he says that when Sultān Firūz, on hearing that Deo Rāy of Bījānagar had invaded his kingdom, marched from Gulbarga to Sāghir, he seized one of the *zamīndārs* of Sāghir, who was a bold and reckless *kāfir*, and had a force of seven thousand or eight thousand Hindūs (Kolīs), and had him put to death. The Cambridge History of India calls it a rebellion of the

object of his (martial) spirit. As some refractory people had taken up a position in the fort of Shal ar he turned in the first instance to punish them. Immediately on hearing the news of his advance the

kols headed by a Hindu chieftain on the north bank of the Krishna. Firishtah also says that when Sultān Firuz was still at Saqlar news was brought that Narsingh Rāy the ruler of the fort of Kehrā (Wali Qila i Kehrā the Hindu kingdom of Kerala) or more properly perhaps the Rājā of Kehrā as Col Briggs describes him had invaded the country of Berar and plundered and devastated as far as the fort of Māhur and had caused much insult and loss to many Musalmāns and that he had done this at the instigation and with the aid of the rulers of Mandū and Var (i.e. the Muhammadan kings of Mālwa and Khāndesh) and also at the instigation and motion of the Rājā of Bijānagar. The Sultān had therefore to send back the armies of Berar and Daulatābad to redress the matters and he himself started for the Krishna with twelve thousand horsemen. This invasion by the Rājā of Kehrā has not been mentioned by Nizām ud din but the Cambridge History of India agrees with Firishtah. It calls the Rājā of Kehrā Narsingh the good Rājā of Kherā.

Firishtah does not say that Firūz Shāh wanted to conquer Bijānagar. On the other hand he has a great deal to say about the Sultān's *harām* which contained nine ladies from Arabia nine from Ajam besides ladies from Turkey, Firang (Europe), Khita (China) and Afghānistan and Rajputāna and Bengal and Gujrat and Tilang and Kanara and Mahratta. These ladies had attendants from their own countries so that they might conform to their own customs and speak their own languages and the Sultān conversed with every one of them in her own language.

Firishtah also says that according to various historians he carried on *Qha'ā* (religious war) with the *Lafirs* twenty four times that Mulla Dūd Bidari and the author of the *Sirāj ut tawārīkh* have described some of them in detail but he does not himself mention particulars of any of them. Then he goes on to say that in the year 801 A.H. Deo Rājā of Bijanagar invaded the Doab of the Tungābhadrā and the Krishna with a large army for the conquest of the forts of Mudkal and Raichore and some of the *parganas* in their neighbourhood.

Mr Sewell see page 50 of his *A Forgotten Empire* says that there was peace between Bijanagar and the Bahmani kingdom during the reign of Harihar II of Vijayanagar and then he quotes the passage from Firishtah about the invasion of the Doab in 801 A.H. He places the movement of the Hindu army at the beginning of the cold season of 1398 A.D. probably not later than December of that year. The Hijri year 801 extending from 13th September 1398 to the 3rd September 1399. Mr Sewell thinks that Harihara II was too old to lead the invasion himself and that it was probably a bold dash made by his son Bukka II who afterwards succeeded him towards the end of 1399 with his permission.

rebels fled and concealed themselves in nooks and corners. The Sultān leaving the *dārogha* (apparently the officer-in-charge of the government), proceeded by successive marches, and encamped on the bank of the river Kṛishnā. But as it was impossible to cross the river at that time, there was necessarily a delay there. The Rāj of Bijānagar came with a great army, and took up a position on the other side of the river. The Sultān was very anxious and distressed, on account of these obstacles and delays, and had frequent consultations with the loyal *amīrs*. Then one day ¹ Qāzī Sūrāj, who was one of his special advisers and friends, and had very great reputation for bravery and cleverness informed him that the solution of this problem could only be effected by having recourse to trickery and deceit, and this slave (i.e., he himself), with some of his companions, on whom he had complete faith and reliance, would in any way that may be possible, cross the river and reach the Bijānagar army. Let a noble order be issued that the men should arm themselves and be ready. The easiest way would be that ² *pushtwāras* should be made of wood and grass, and placing the necessary furniture and things on them, he and his companions would cross the river, and as soon as there would be a great noise and uproar in the army of

It would appear, therefore, that instead of what Nizām-ud dīn says about Firūz Shāh's martial spirit inciting him to invade Bijānagar, he was only compelled to march towards Bijānagar to repel the invasion of Bukka II.

¹ The Cambridge History of India calls him Qāzī Sūrāj-ud-dīn and describes him as an inferior officer of the Court.

² The word is *سوارے* in the MSS and *سٹاری* in the lith. ed. They were I suppose some kind of rafts or basket boats. In the corresponding passage of Firishtah, it is said that "two hundred *sabads* (baskets), which in the idiom of the people of the Deccan were called *Naukras* covered with cow hides were made ready." In Scott's Firishtah, page 76, they are called hurdles covered with leather, but Col Briggs calls them baskets, and he says in a note (Vol II, page 371) that "the same sort of basket boats, used in the Tigris, in the time of Herodotus, are still employed there, and are almost the only description of passage boats known in the Indian Peninsula, at this day, to the natives of the country. A detachment of the British army crossed its heavy guns, without even dismounting them over the Toongbudra in 1812 in these basket-boats".

the enemy order should be given that the ¹soldiers should without any hesitation cross the river. There was hope that the beautiful form of victory and triumph should appear in the mirror of their purpose and aim.

The Sultān having accepted this counsel Qazı Siraj with seven other men crossed the river and mingled with the army of the Ray of Bijanagar. ³They took up their quarters in the house (or quarters) of the musicians. As the Qazı had great skill in the art of music and showed some of the finer and subtler points of the art to the musicians after a few days when the Ray of Bijanagar held a great festival and summoned all the musicians the Qazı and his companions also went to the *maylis* with the other musicians. After the Ray of Bijanagar and the other Rays had become intoxicated the Qazı showed some feats the like of which the Ray had never seen in his life and everyone acknowledged the superiority and mastery of the Qazı in the art. The latter having waited for a suitable opportunity plunged his poisoned dagger into the malevolent breast of the Ray and tore it open, and his companions also drawing their daggers cut off the heads of the other Rays. When the shouts

¹ It would appear from the Qazı's plan and the success which attended it that it was not so much the tumultuous waters of the Kāri hna that the Sultan's army was afraid to cross as it was the fact of having to cross the river in the face of a strong and vigilant hostile army for as soon as the Qazı by assassinating the Ray and his commander threw that army into disorder the Sultan's army had no difficulty in crossing the river.

The words in one MS. and in the lith. ed. are در آنه مراد in the other MS. they are در آنه مراد و مطلوب.

³ The account of what the Qazı and his companions did is given in much greater detail by Firishtah and there are also many differences in matters of detail which it is not necessary to mention here except that according to Firishtah the Qazı and one of his companions entered the *maylis* having assumed the female garb ogling and smiling and dancing and playing on the *mandals* and making no doubt very grotesque figures of themselves. One matter of detail is however of very considerable importance namely that it was the Rāy's son and not the Ray himself that was holding the *maylis* and that it was the Ray's son that was assassinated. This is confirmed by Mr. Sewell also who says that after his son had been murdered Bukka reached Vijayanagar in safety and took refuge behind its fortifications.

and upon of the Hindūs reached the Sultān,¹ he in his own person crossed the river. He made that crowd, without a head food for the sword, and those who escaped the sword were carried off as slaves. So much booty fell into his hands, that the accountant of time found it difficult to make a note of it all. The Sultān made Fūlād Khān governor of that *sūba* and returned to his capital. There he arranged a great festival and made all the well-known *amīrs* happy by his favours and great rewards. The "grand assemblage and the festivities for the conquest of Bijānagar had not yet been concluded, that a messenger came from Badhūl, and submitted the report, that Deo Rāy had on account of his great pride and hauteur sent an army of three hundred thousand infantry to that neighbourhood for the following reasons, viz. that he had

¹ There are also greater details in Firishtah, of what happened after the assassination of the Rāy's son. First a body of four thousand men crossed the river, and then the Sultān also crossed it, before the morning. The Rāy made no efforts for resistance, but fled taking the dead body of his son with him. The Sultān's army pursued the Hindūs to the vicinity of Bijānagar, taking much booty and many prisoners, and defeating the Hindūs in several actions. The Sultān also sent the Khān Khānān and Mīr Fazl-ul-lah Ānjū Shīrāzi to ravage the Rāy's territory south of Bijānagar which was very fruitful and populous. As many Brahmins had been taken prisoners, their relations and the other *raiyats* prayed that emissaries should be sent to the Sultan to try to effect their release. Mīr Fazl-ul-lah carried out the negotiations, and the prisoners were released on the payment of eleven lakhs of *hūns* (a *hūn* according to Col. Briggs, amounts, on an average, to three and a half to four rupees, or about eight shillings), ten lakhs going to the Sultān's treasury, and one lakh to Mīr Fazl-ul-lah as his remuneration. After this the Sultān released the prisoners, and returned towards his capital, leaving Fūlād Khān to assume charge of the *Doāb*.

² Contrary to this, it appears from Firishtah, that several things happened between Firūz Shāh's first and second campaigns against Bijānagar. The first campaign took place in 801 A H. In 802 A H, the Sultān invaded the territory of Narsingh Rāy of Kehrlā, and reduced him to subjection. In 804 A H, Firūz Shāh sent an embassy to Taimūr, who it appears was then contemplating the conquest of Hindūstan, and offering his submission and proposing to render help and send reinforcements, in the event of his sending an army to conquer Hindūstan. The embassy was graciously received by Taimūr. After this the rulers of Gujrāt, Mālwa and Khāndesh sent embassies to Firūz Shāh asking for his friendship, but at the same time, they sent messages to the Rāy of Bijānagar offering to help him, if necessary, in his wars against Firūz Shāh.

received information that there was a maiden in those parts who had the shape and form of a *pari* and the face like the full moon and who had no rival under the blue dome of the sky and his men had after much search and investigation had to return disappointed

As to the beautiful maiden Firihah on the authority of Mullah Dard Bidari says that she was the daughter of a goldsmith who lived in a village in the neighbourhood of the town of Mudkal. Mr. Sewell apparently on the authority of Firihah makes her the daughter of a farmer living in the town of Mudkal but both the lithed of Firihah and Col Briggs state that she was the daughter of a goldsmith living in a village near Mudkal. According to the lithed of Firihah her name was *فريهال* *Furihāl* and Mr. Sewell calls her *Parthāl* but Col Briggs gave her the name of *Nehāl*. Her parents following the customs of the country wanted to betroth her in her girlhood to a youth of her own caste but she prayed that the ceremony might be delayed with such earnestness that they consented. Then a Brahman who was returning from Benares saw her and was struck with her beauty. He taught her music and dancing and then went to Bijanagar and went to the Rāy. According to Mr. Sewell the reigning Rāy was Bukka II's successor and brother Deva Rāy I who began to reign in November 140 A.D. On hearing the Brahman's account of the girl's beauty and accomplishments the Rāy sent him back with rich gifts to bring the girl and her parents to Bijanagar. The parents were overjoyed but when they attempted to throw a beautiful jewelled necklace which the Brahman had brought around her neck and the wearing of which would be the mark of her betrothal she with tears besought them to desist and told them that if she became a *Rānī* of Bijanagar she would never again be allowed to see them or any of her other relations. Her parents acceded to her tearful request and the Brahman had to go back disappointed to Bijanagar. The maiden afterwards told her parents that she had long had an inward conviction that she was destined to be the wife of a prince of the faith of Islam and asked them to await the will of Providence. Nizām ud din does not say so but it may be mentioned here in passing that she afterwards became the wife of Hasan Khān the son of Sultān Firuz who did not however succeed him.

On hearing the Brahman's account of the failure of his mission the Rāy was much annoyed. He at once marched out with an army and on reaching the bank of the Tungabhadra sent five thousand selected horsemen across the river to march to Mudkal and to bring the maiden and the whole of her family with them but without doing them any injury. As the Rāy had not sent the Brahman back to apprise the family of the maiden of his intention they like all the other villagers fled to distant places and the troops had to return unsuccessful. They however devastated the country and when Fālād Khān after collecting his army opposed them they outnumbered his men and he had to fall back.

and discouraged. When this news had reached Fūlād Khān, he had at the time of the return of the Bijānagar army obstructed their passage, and had sent many of them to their real place (*i.e.*, hell)

After receiving the information of these occurrences, the Sultān sent a special robe of honour and Arab horses to Fūlād Khān, and himself turned his attention to the punishment of Deo Rāy. He marched by successive stages with a large army, and passed into the kingdom of Bijānagar. He stretched his hands to ravage and devastate the country, and so much plunder came into his hands that it was beyond the bounds of estimation. After plundering the country, he advanced to the fort (of Bijānagar), the approaches to which were extremely narrow. Although the *amīrs* and the loyal servants of the Sultān pointed out, that it was not advisable for him to enter them, he did not listen to them but relying on his high destiny and the assistance of heaven he penetrated into them and when he arrived close to the fort, he arranged his troops, and placed himself in the centre of the line. Deo Rāy also came out of the fort with nine lakhs of infantry, and arranged them in front of the Sultān's army. As the numbers of the enemy exceeded the estimate Sultān Firūz commenced the engagement in his own person, and made blood to flow in streams, from the enemy's army. He galloped about in the battle field, and challenged warriors of the hostile army to single combat. Suddenly an arrow from the bow of fate struck his hand, but ¹ tying up the wound, he stood firm on the field of bravery and the plain of heroism. The Khān Khānān, Shāhẓāda Ahmad Khān, who was the commander of the vanguard, also performed feats of valour.

When the world-illuminating sun bound the black veil over his bright forehead, the drum of return was beaten, and the army took up its former position. The next day ² Sultān Firūz Shāh

¹ The words in the MSS, as well as in the lith. ed. are *برو پاک بسته*. I cannot make out the meaning of *برو پاک*. According to Firishtah the Sultān did not show any distress, but drew out the arrow with his own hand, and, without dismounting, tied up his arm.

² Firishtah says that the Sultān's plans were more extensive and far reaching. He sent the Khān Khānān with ten thousand horse to lay waste the country to the south of Bijānagar, and sent Mīr Fazl-ul-lah Ānjū Shirāzī to take

devastated and ravaged the country surrounding the fort and for some days was engaged in measure of pillage and destruction and the whole country was laid waste. Then Dō Rāy with (great) humility sent an ambassador and prayed for the pardon of his offences and making promises of loyalty sent much tribute consisting of elephant of the size of mountains and various kinds of fabrics and stuffs. The Sultan on account of his innate kindness accepted his excuses and turned his back for his return.

As Firuz Shah's heart was always engaged with the conquest of new dominions he marched with a well equipped army for the conquest of the Marhatta country at a moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Mahur the *thanidar* there offered many fine and beautiful presents.

the fort of Bankājir one of the most celebrated fortresses of the Karnatik. The *Khān Ikhān* returned with sixty thousand prisoners and much plunder and Bankājir was captured. It was then decided that the *Ikhān Ikhān* should be in charge of the operations against Bijapur and the Sultan and Mir Faizullah should march against Adoni. Dō Rāy then sent some of his chiefs to sue for peace. The Sultan at first refused to listen to his prayers but at last agreed to the following conditions:—that the Rāy should give one of his daughters in marriage to the Sultan besides much money and pearls and elephants and thousands of slaves. The marriage was celebrated with great pomp and splendour but in the end the Sultan was offended because the Rāy did not accompany him all the way to his camp when he returned to it at the end of the marriage festivities. So in spite of the alliance there was still animosity between them. The Sultan then returned to his capital.

¹ Firishtah places this campaign in 802 A.H. 1399 A.D. long before the war against Bijānagar which took place in 809 A.H. The campaign according to Firishtah was also of longer duration. Narsingh Rāy the Rājā of Kehrā (Nizam ud-din calls him Harsingh Rāy) met the Sultan's army at a distance of two *manils* or stages from his capital (Col Briggs says two *coses* from Kehrā) and there was a severe conflict and the Sultan's army was at first beaten and it was reported that the *Ikhān Khān* had been slain. Mir Faizullah however fought bravely and he was joined by the *Khān Khān* the Hindus were defeated and Hosai Rāy (called Gopāl Rāy by Col Briggs) the son of Narsingh Rāy was taken prisoner. Kehrā was then besieged and after two months the garrison being reduced to great distress Narsingh sued for peace which was soon concluded Narsingh Rāy giving one of his daughters in marriage to the Sultan and also valuable presents including 10 elephants and a large sum of money.

He then traversed many stages, and arriving at Kehilā (the ancient Kerala), laid siege to that fortress and devastated the country all round it. Harsingh Rāy the Rāy of Kehilā, having with great humility made his submission petitioned for the pardon of his offences, and bringing some valuable presents, gems and gold and twenty ¹ chains of elephants came to render homage, and presented the keys of the forts. The Sultān gave him a seat in front of the throne, and having given him Arab horses and a gold embroidered robe and a jewelled belt gave him permission to go back (to his capital)

Returning from there, after a few days, he sent bodies of men to different parts of his dominions to collect the revenue, and the men who were sent, brought after a time immense quantities of treasure and elephants and gold and gems

² At this time also, the engineer of his thoughts planned a city on the bank of the river, into all the houses in which there should be running water. After it had been finished, he gave it the name of Firūzābād. He built a noble mansion, the turrets of which raised their heads and claimed rivalry in altitude with the stars, for his own palace

¹ The word is سلسله, *Silsila* a chain. I have never seen it used before, with reference to elephants. The expression for an elephant is *el zinjir fil*. *Silsila* probably is synonymous with *zinjir*. A *halqa* of elephants is the collective name for one hundred elephants.

² Firishtah mentions the building of Firūzābād, but the date of the building of the city cannot be ascertained. From what is said in the lith ed of Firishtah, it would appear that Firūz Shāh's love for fair women had something to do with the building of the city. It is said there سلطان فیروز شاہ چون بریاں بری طاوس زیب رخت تمام داشت سہری بر کنار بہر نیورہ موسوم بہرور آباد بنا کردہ Col Briggs, however, does not say anything of the kind. He simply says, "Firūz Shāh built a town on the bank of the river Beema." Neither Firishtah nor Col Briggs says anything about the flowing water being brought into all the houses, but they say that a canal was brought from the river into the fort, and along this, kiosks were built for the ladies. It may be mentioned here, that the palace at Firūzābād was, later on, allotted by Ahmad Shāh, the next Sultān, to Hasan Khān, the indolent and lotus eating son of Firūz Shāh.

¹ And about this time news came that Amir Saiyyad Muhammad Cisu darīz who was one of the holy men of the age and among the disciples of Shaikh Nasir ud din Muhammad Diudi was coming from the direction of Delhi His Majesty the Sultan was highly pleased and happy on account of the grandeur of the noble advent of that great Saiyyad and went forward to welcome him After having the pleasure of meeting him the Sultan suggested that as that country had now become illuminated by the reflection of the sun of his grandeur he hoped that the shadow of the safety conferred by his presence should continue to be spread over the people of the country His holiness the Saiyyad acceded to the prayer and took up his residence in the city of Gulbarga

¹ Firishtah places the arrival in 810 A H 1410 A D

He is called Amir Saiyyad Muhammad Cisu Dar z in one MS and in the lith ed In the other MS and in Firishtah he is called Mir Saiyyad Muhammad Cisu Dar iz There is considerable difference between the statements of Nizām ud din and Firishtah as to the treatment accorded to the holy man According to the former Firūz Shāh showed great respect and reverence to him but he was annoyed with him when he refused to bless his son Hasan Khān and said that Ahmad Khān his brother and not Hasan Khān would succeed him On the other hand Firishtah says that Firuz Shāh at first received him with great respect but when he found him deficient in علم ظاهري خصوصا معقولات i.e. natural sciences specially those founded on the reasoning faculty he did not pay him so much attention as before but the king's brother Ahmad Khān had very great belief in him and continued to attend on him Nizām ud din says that Firuz Shāh took his son Hasan Khān to the holy man and telling him that he had made him his heir asked for his benediction when the Saiyyad told him that his son was not fashioned for the robe of a Sultan but Firishtah says that Firūz Shah after declaring Hasan Khān his successor and giving him all the paraphernalia of royalty sent men to the Saiyyad for his blessings the latter said that when the Sultān had already declared Hasan Khān to be his successor what necessity was there for his prayers in his favour When the Sultān again sent men to him and asked with greater insistence for his prayers then he said that it was his brother and not his son that would succeed him

Firistah goes on to say that the Sultan sent word to the Saiyyad that his residence was too near the fort (palace) and there was always a great crowd there and that he should therefore go out of the city The Saiyyad had to comply with the order and he took up his residence outside the city where his adherent soon erected a fine house for him at the spot where his tomb now stands Col Briggs adds in a note that the tomb now standing was either

¹ It is said that one day, Sultān Firūz Shāh had his eldest son who bore the name of Hasan Khān, arrayed in a special dress, and made him his heir. He then took him with himself to his holiness the Saiyyad, and informed the latter that as he had selected the prince to be his heir, he hoped that his holiness should cast an eye (of favour) on his affairs and should not withdraw the hand of his training from over his head. The holy Saiyyad declared, that the fashioner of providence and fate had prepared the robe of sovereignty for the person of the Khān Khānān Ahmad Khān, and no one can object to the ordinances of fate. The Sultān was annoyed at these words, and left the place.

As the rainy season was now over, ² he marched with a large army towards Aīankal (Warangal). When he arrived in that country, he saw a fort built of hard stone, which raised its head to the blue dome of the sky, and round it there was a deep ditch dug, which was thirty *dina'* (yards) in breadth, and which was connected with (or filled with) water from a spring. His Majesty, the Sultān, remained for two years at the foot of the fort, and was, in spite of that, unable to carry out his object, and on account of the (bad)

built or erected by a descendant of the Saiyyad, Muhammad Amīn Husamī in 640 A D, in the reign of Muhammad 'Ādil Shāh of Bijāpūr.

¹ There are slight variations in the readings here. One MS has حکایہ گوید, i.e., an anecdote, they say. The other MS has only گوید, they say, while the lith. ed. has روایت کرد, they narrate.

² According to Firishtah he did not march against Warangal or Telingāna, but in 820 A H, 1417 A D, he sent ambassadors to the Rāy of Telingāna demanding arrears of tribute, and the latter sent enough in money and goods to satisfy him. Then Firūz Shāh marched against the fort of Pāngal, which Firishtah says, was in his time called Bilkonda, and was situated at a distance of eighty *farsangs* (240 miles) from the fort of Adoni. Col Briggs says in a note that at the present time Pāngal has no other name, and is 70 miles from Adoni. Nizām-ud-dīn apparently mixes up the two incidents of the demand of tribute from the Rāy of Telingāna, and the siege of Pāngal. He does not give the name of the fort, but it is clear that it was Pāngal that he was referring to. It would appear, however, from what Nizām-ud-dīn himself said, that Pāngal was in Bijānagar and not in Telingāna, and Firishtah also says, that he besieged the fort, completely disregarding his relation with the Rāy of Bijānagar. Mr. Sewell however, calls it the Warangal fortress Pāngal (page 65).

climate of the place most of the men and quadrupeds (in his army) were destroyed. When Deo Ray of Bijanagar became acquainted with what had happened he took advantage of the opportunity and sent a large army of cavalry and infantry and obstructed the entrances and the exits. The Sultan was compelled therefore to leave the place for the return journey. Deo Ray's soldiers attacked the army with arrows and spears. The ¹warriors belonging to the Sultan's army then attacked Deo Ray's troops but as the ways were narrow they were unable to accomplish anything. They represented to the Sultan that at such a crisis it would be fit and proper for him to hasten away and reach a place of safety for the safety of the army they said was bound up with the safety of the sovereign. The Sultan said: How can it be allowed in the religion of manliness and humanity that I should go to a place of safety and leave my soldiers to perish or to be taken prisoners. At this conjuncture a person having the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit coming from the enemy's army inflicted a wound on the Sultan and fighting bravely escaped out of the orbit of the Sultan's army. The *amirs* seizing the Sultan's bridle took him out of the danger and carried him away to ²Gulburga.

The Sultan then wrote letters giving an account of the events and couched in sincere language to Sultan Ahmad of Gujrat and

¹ Firishtah's account is different and altogether more probable. He says that Mir Fazl ul lah rallying the soldiers nearly defeated the Bijanagar army when *نکی ار کفار کهنه* a Hindu of Cahnara who had been a long time in his service but who had been seduced by the promise of a high dignity by Deo Ray killed him by inflicting a serious wound on his head. The Sultan's army was now routed and the Sultan with the assistance of Ahmad Khan escaped with the remnant of his army. Firishtah does not mention the Sultan's being wounded by a person with the form of a demon and the nature of an evil spirit.

There are slight differences in the readings. One MS has *صربی بر سلطان رد* the other has *صربی بر سر سلطان رد* while the lith ed has *صربی سلطان رد*.

² Firishtah goes on to say that the Hindus (I am quoting from Col. Briggs) made a general massacre of the Musalmans and subsequently took many towns, broke down mosques and other holy places, slaughtered the people without mercy and by their savage conduct seemed desirous to discharge the vengeance and resentment of many ages.

asked for help from him. But the ¹army of Gujrat had not yet arrived, when the Sultān fell ill from excessive anger (or mortification), and as his illness increased, some of his adherents wanted that they should seize the Khān Khānān, prince Ahmad Khān, and should draw a pencil across his world-seeing eyes. The Khān Khānān receiving information of this withdrew himself into the corner of safety. The soldiers however came from all sides and joined him. Firūz Shāh sent one of his slaves with twenty thousand horsemen and some elephants to crush him. After the two armies had met, ² Firūz Shāh's army fled. The latter in spite of his illness

¹ According to Firishtah, however, Sultān Ahmad (of Gujrat) having only recently ascended the throne, and his affairs being still unsettled, the message had no effect, but the king's brother Ahmad Khān, the Khān Khānān, opened the door of the treasury, collected a new army, and drove the Bijānagar troops out of the kingdom.

² Firishtah says, that when Firūz Shāh's illness was prolonged, the management of affairs fell into the hands of two slaves, named, respectively, Hushiyār 'Ain-ul-mulk and Bīdār Nizām-ul-mulk, and they told the Sultān, that as Ahmad Khān was very powerful and popular, his son Hasan Khān could only succeed him, if Ahmad Khān could be removed, and Firūz Shāh also remembered what Saiyyad Muhammad Gīsū-Darāz had told him about the succession, and he determined upon depriving Ahmad Khān of his eye sight.

³ According to Firishtah, the Khān Khānān did not have such an easy success. He first of all went to Saiyyad Muhammad Gīsū Darāz, taking his son 'Alā ud-dīn with him. The Saiyyad took his own turban from his head and divided it into two parts, and bound them on the heads of the father and the son. Col Briggs says erroneously, that it was 'Alā-ud-dīn's turban that was cut into two portions. After that the Khān left home early the next morning with only four hundred tried soldiers. At the gate he was joined by Khalf Hasan of Basrah who was an old friend of his. He dissuaded him from attaching himself to his hopeless cause, but Khalf Hasan refused to leave him, and it was his advice and help that conduced to his success. Firishtah agrees with our author in saying that after the Khān Khānān's first success Firūz Shāh got into a palankin, and advanced against the Khān Khānān, but he says that before doing this, he had the umbrella of sovereignty placed over the head of his son Hasan Khān. In the second battle, which took place at a distance of three *karōhs* from Hasanābād Gulbarga, Firūz Shāh fainted owing to his great weakness, and the report got about that he had been killed. The soldiers then went over to the Khān Khānān. The latter out of regard for his brother did not pursue him. Firūz Shāh entered the fort, and the Khān Khānān encamped outside. Then Hushiyār 'Ain-ul-mulk and Bīdār Nizām-ul-mulk began to

got into a palanquin and advanced to the battle field. At the time however when the troops were arrived for battle most of the soldiers fled and joined the Khan Khanan. On seeing this state of things he returned to the city and turned the men out of the *durran khana* (audience hall) and sent the keys of the fort and the treasures by the hands of the great men of the city to Ahmad Khan.

Verses

He (alone) is wise who in all things
 Sometimes accepts flowers and sometimes thorns
 With every morsel thou canst not sugar find
 Sometimes comes the clear (wine) and sometimes the dreg.

The Khan Khanan desirous of rendering the rights which his brother had by having trained him and brought him up went alone into the palace and issued the ground of service. Firuz Shah descended from the throne and took him into his arms and holding his hand led him up to the throne. He opened his mouth with pleasant and kind words and filled Ahmad Khan's ears with the precious gems of advice. They both wept out of brotherly love and Firuz Shah commended his children to the care of his brother and on the night of the 4th of Shawwāl 820 A H when the dawn raised its head over the turrets of the horizon the hand of that marauder Death plundered the capital of his life. According to

discharge cannon and musket shots at the Ilān Ilānān's camp and one cannon ball struck his tent and some of his attendants were killed and he had to move his camp further back.

After this Firuz Shāh told Hasan Khan that the soldiers having joined his uncle it was not possible for him to ascend the throne. He also ordered the gate to be opened and sent for his brother who came and placed his head on his feet. Firuz Shāh then surrendered the sovereignty to the Khan Khanan and placed his son in the latter's charge. The same day the 5th Shawwāl 820 A H September 10th 14° A D Ahmad Khan Khan Ilānān ascended the throne and called himself Ahmad Shāh Bahmani. Ten days later Firuz Shāh died.

¹ See the latter part of the last note. Mr Sewell quoting Scott's translation of Firishtah page 9 and counting the length of Firuz Shāh's reign gives the 4th Shawwāl 820 A H 4th September 142 A D as the date of his death.

² This gives one a shock after the somewhat idyllic picture of brotherly love just painted but Firishtah has something equally bad if not worse

that country and came to a sea port. On the way a Saivjad of the name of Nasir ud din Arab to whom Sultan Ahmad had entrusted a large sum of money so that he might go to Karbala and open out a stream of water there met him. Saivjad Nasir ud din did not show such respect to Shir Malik as the latter had expected. He merely met him mounted as he was. Shir Malik told his servants and they made Nasir ud din dismount from his horse. The Saivjad returned from that place and came into the presence of the Sultan and informed the latter of what had happened. The Sultan comforted him and sent him back. After some days Shir Malik arrived near (the place where the Sultan was) and high and low hastened to meet him and brought him to the royal threshold. And at the very instant when the Sultan's eye fell on him he ordered that an elephant of the name of ¹Qassab might be brought in to the presence and at that very moment without any talk or discussion Shir Malik was thrown under the elephant's feet. The Sultan said: This is the punishment for insulting Saivjads.

When the Sultan was established on the throne of State news came that the army of Sultan Ahmad Cujrati which Sultan Iruz had summoned had arrived at the frontier. Ahmad Shah sent presents and gifts for Sultan Ahmad, and gave permission to the *amirs* of Cujrat to return and he also sent presents to the *amirs* in accordance with their condition and rank.

² As Deo Ray had been guilty of unmannerly conduct during the reign of I'rūz Shah Sultan Ahmad Shah in retaliation of that

¹ The name appears to be قصاب *Qasāb* in the MSS and تساب *Tasab* in the lith ed. It is قصاب *Qasab* (butcher according to Col Briggs) in Firishtah.

I cannot find any mention of this in Firishtah. On the other hand the latter says سلطان احمد سلا حاض و عام را مطيع و معتاد حرد صاحب و سرحد گجرات را با امرای معتبر سترده حاضر از آن طرف مع کرد Sultān Ahmad Shāh made high and low submissive to himself and placed the frontier of Gujrat in charge of trustworthy *amirs* and thus assured his mind on that side.

² Instead of the very vague and sketchy account of the campaign which follows Firishtah has a long and graphic account which may be summarised thus. The Sultan advanced with forty thousand horsemen to the Tungabhadra. The Ray of Bijanagar also advanced to the river after summoning the Rāy of

of Bijanagar he commenced to plunder and ravage (the country) Deo Ray who had been rubbing his head with the zenith of the revolving sky now withdrew his hand from the reins of government and sent one of his trusted adherents with gifts and presents to attend on Ahmad Shah and asked for pardon of his offences. The Sultan drew the pen of forgiveness over his guilt and sent *farman* couched in friendly language. Deo Ray then came forward with humility and submission and sent everything that he had promised to send and became included in the band of the Sultan's friends and adherents. The Sultan returned with victory and triumph and when he arrived at the capital he distinguished the *amirs* with ¹ promotion in rank and robes of honour and gave them permission to return to their own *thānas*.

After a short time the Sultan wrote a letter to Nasir Khan of Asir proposing a marriage for his true son Sultan Ala ud din and sent it by the hand of Aziz Khan Namī. When the letter reached Nasir Khan he agreed to the alliance prepared the necessary things for the chaste and pure veiled one and sent her with his sons and attendants and servants and troops to the capital (Ahmadabad Bidar or Gulbarga) so that the usual rites and ceremonies of festivity might be performed and gave permission with all politeness and respect to Aziz Khan to return. Sultan Ahmad welcomed the delightful advent of the guests with pleasure and gratitude and made them happy with his great lavishness and

surrounded and had to take shelter in a mud enclosure but as he was riding he was probably riding down antelope

¹ One MS. inserts the word مناسب (suitable) after مناسب

The marriage according to Firishtah took place some time after 830 A H 14 6 A D and after the expeditions to Talingāna which according to Nizām ud din occurred in 8 6 and 828 respectively so that according to the correct chronological order the account of the marriage should succeed and not precede the account of the Talingana campaign. The ruler of Asir is called Nasir Khān ruler of Asir. He claimed to be a descendant of his holiness Umar Farūq in the Persian text of Firishtah but Col Briggs calls him Nuscer Khan Farooky ruler of Kandeish. The bride was sent according to Firishtah to Ahmadabad Bidar and was lodged in a garden outside the city. The festivities continued for two months and the bride was brought into the city and at an auspicious moment the marriage took place.

benefactions, and spread the shadow of safety and of his kindness on the guests and the residents, and kept open the gates of pleasure and enjoyment, so that men might occupy themselves in various pleasures, and ¹ take what was due to them from the cup bearer of time. The Sultān summoned the Qāzīs and the learned men, and the men possessing the knowledge of God, and the great men of the city and arranged the marriage assembly and (afterwards) he sent back the sons and the adherents of Nasir Khān after showing them every honour, and conferring on them many marks of his kindness.

In the year 826 A H, Sultān Ahmad Shāh collected an immense army, and ² advanced towards the country of Tilang, but on account of certain matters connected with the kingdom, he returned from the way, and came back to Gulbarga. Then in the year ³ 828 A H, 1424 A D, he again advanced towards Tilang, and certain

¹ The meaning is not quite clear. The actual words are ارساوی وقت داد, according to the MSS. The lith. ed. has ارساوی وقت داد, according to the MSS. The lith. ed. has ارساوی وقت داد, according to the MSS.

² Firishtah does not mention this expedition which ended so abruptly. The affairs of state, which Nizām-ud-dīn refers to, but does not describe, were the total failure of rain in 826 and 827 A H. In 826, no rain fell, streams and wells became dried up, and the ground parched. Sultān Ahmad Shāh opened the doors of his treasury, and supported his troops. He also opened the doors of the public granaries, and fed the poor and the needy. The next year also there was no rain, and the Sultān in great distress called upon the learned and pious men and Shaikhs to pray for rain, but this had no effect, so the people became seditious, and spoke of the reign as unlucky. Then the Sultān in great sorrow went out to the open country, and going on an eminence bowed down in prayer, and placing his head on the ground made lamentations and supplications. About this time clouds gathered together, and rain began to fall. This is the translation of the passage in the lith. ed., but Col. Briggs says that "the Sultān repaired to the mosque in state to crave heaven's mercy for his subjects." The Persian text goes on to say, that so much rain fell, that the men who had accompanied the Sultān began to shiver, and they acclaimed the Sultān with the title of *Walī* or Saint.

³ Mr. Sewell says that 828 A H began only on November 23rd, 1424, but the campaign was very short and may have been finished before the end of December. The account of the expedition as given by Firishtah is different from that given in the text. According to Firishtah the Sultān marched to Golkonda, where he halted for a month and twenty days, and sent Khān Ā'azam 'Abd ul-

forts which at the time of the catastrophe (in Firuz Shah's reign) had passed out of the Sultan's possession again came into it. He then took tribute from the Kalantars or chiefs of Rajkonda and Deorkonda and returned to Culbarga.

In the year 829 A.H. news came that the Ray of Mahur had strayed from the path of allegiance and was bent on war and bloodshed. Sultan Ahmad Shah collected an army which was beyond all calculation and advanced to punish him. The Ray fortified himself in the fort of Mahur. The Dakini army ravaged the neighbourhood of the fort and rased everything to the ground. In the end the Ray came forward with humility and repentance and joined the band of the Sultan's¹ loyal adherents and whatever had been in his possession came again into the Sultan's possession.

Latif as commander of the vanguard. When he advanced again news came that the Rāy had arrayed his army for battle but had been defeated and slain with seven thousand of his cavalry and infantry. The Sultan on reaching Warangal took possession of the city and all the treasure which the Rāy and his ancestors had collected. He then gave a suitable reward to the Khān Āzām Abd ul Latif and sent him to conquer the other portions of the kingdom and he returned to the Sultan at Warangal after conquering the whole country in the course of three or four months. If this account be accepted then Mr Sewell's remark that the campaign might have been finished before the end of 1494 cannot be correct.

As to Nizām ud din's account I cannot find any mention in the other accounts of this expedition of Rāj-konda or Deorkonda or their Kalāntars. But it appears from the accounts of the reign of Sultān Humāyūn grandson of Sultān Ahmad Shāh as given by both Nizām ud din and Firishtah that the Telegus of Deorkonda offered a stout resistance to the generals of Sultān Humāyūn. This is also mentioned by Mr Sewell in page 98 of his book where he calls the place Devarakonda. And in page 132 of his book he says that Sultān Qulī Qutb Shāh of Golkonda took Razukonda and Devarakonda fortresses respectively S.E. and S.S.E. of Hyderābād in Telangana. Razu-konda (which is apparently identical with Rāj-konda) and Devarakonda are both shown in the map of South India opposite to page 76 of Mr Sewell's book so there may be some foundation for Nizām ud din's statement.

¹ Contrary to this Firishtah says that after the *Zamindar* of Mahūr had submitted the Sultan breaking his engagement with him had him and five or six thousand Hindus put to death and imprisoned their sons and daughters and forced them to become Musalmans. Firishtah also says that at this time the Sultan took possession of the fort of Kalan (Briggs calls it Kullum) and also of

¹ After the conquest of Māhūr as the kingdom became more extensive, the *amīrs* submitted that one of the Shāhzādas might be declared to be the hen apparent, and *sūbas* might be allotted to the others so that the rule of sincerity and friendship might continue among the "brothers of purity." The Sultān said, 'Please tell me whatever might have been decided in your minds on the subject of the hen apparent.' The *amīrs* submitted "Shāhzāda 'Alā-ud-dīn is endowed with high attributes and is most anxious and painstaking in the management of measures for the amelioration of the condition of the *rāyyats* and for improving the condition of the poor and oppressed.' The Sultān applauded the opinion of the *amīrs* and appointed Shāhzāda 'Ala-ud-dīn to be the hen apparent and ² made Muhammad Khān over to him. ³ He conferred the country of Māhūr with its dependencies on Shāhzāda Mahmūd Khān, and he gave the fort of Rājūr (Rāichur) with its surrounding country to Dāūd Khān, and took an engagement from all his sons, that they should never be hostile to one another, and should keep the *rāyyats*, and the poor and oppressed, who have been entrusted to them by God, in comfort. He also directed them that they should treat the following ⁴ four noble classes among men with special respect and

a diamond mine, which had up to that time been in the possession of the ruler of Gondwara

¹ The date of these transactions is not given either by Nizām-ud dīn or by Frishtah, but it appears that they took place between 829 and 833 A H

² The meaning of this is not clear, but the following passage from Frishtah who after saying that the Sultān made 'Alā-ud-dīn his hen says و برادر کوچک او شاهراده محمد خان را که کوچک ترین فرزندان بود شریک ساهی وی گردانید which means, that he made his (i e, 'Ala-ud dīn's) youngest brother, Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān who was his youngest son, co sharer in the kingdom with him (i e, with 'Alā-ud-dīn)

³ According to Frishtah the distribution was different. He says Ramgar (Ramgir according to Col Briggs) and Māhūr and Kalan and a small part of Berār were given to Shāhzāda Mahmūd Khān, and Shāhzāda Dāūd Khān was sent, with the insignia of royalty, and some old and trustworthy *amīrs* to assume the government of Tilang

⁴ It may be mentioned that the four noble classes of the community here mentioned somewhat resemble the four sections of the Indian people as originally classified by the Indian *Sāstras* of Brāhmana, Kshatriya, Vaisya, and Sūdra though of course they were not castes as they later became in India. Frishtah

esteem *viz.* first learned men for their minds are the fountains of philosophy and Divine knowledge second writers as this great band adorn the cheek of the country and the face of the state with ¹ constructive guidance by the tongues of their pens

Couplet

As the Shah in shah's sword lays the foundation of the state

The tongue of the pen of rules becomes its guide

The third are the men of arms for the well being of the people (*ibad* literally the servants of God) and the putting down of all disturbance in the country are bound up with (the existence of) this body and the flashes of the light of their lances which put down all disturbances are the guardians of religion and of the state and the tongue of the ruthless swords explain the texts of victory and triumph The fourth are the cultivators for the stability of the world and the continued existence of mankind are bound up with and sustained by the exertions of this body For if they show any negligence and permit idleness to find its way into their limbs the supply of food which is the means of the maintenance of life and of the sustenance of existence would be completely cut off And after giving necessary counsel and directions he sent Mahmud Khan and Daud Khan to the *subas* to which they had been nominated

Then in the year 830 A H he appointed Khalf Hasan Arab who had the title of Malik ut tujjar to conquer the island of

does not say anything about the Sultan's direction and precepts about these classes

¹ The words the meaning of which is obscure appear to be بحال نعمت in one MS and in the lith ed and بحال نعمت in the other MS

The words here are also somewhat obscure The words in one MS are دولت و لعل نواسان نعل ناسان دس و دولت the other MS has left out the whole passage from لعل نواسان to دولت دس The lith ed agrees with the first MS but substitute ناسان for نواسان and ناسان for نعل ناسان I think that نواسان and ناسان are both incorrect and the proper reading should be نواسان and نعل ناسان is probably better than ناسان I have adopted this reading

² The words which I have translated as the island of Mahaim look like حریدة بهائم in one MS but they are clearly حریدة بهائم in the other In the lith

Mahāim (Māhim). The Malik-ut-tujjār, by the strength of his arms, and his bravery and courage took possession of that country. The Rāys there, who were Musalmāns, went to the presence of Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt for aid. The latter sent a *farmān* to Shāhzāda Zafar Khān who was at Sultānpūr Nadarbar, that he should advance to help those Musalmāns. The Malik-ut-tujjār wrote an account of what had happened, and sent it to Gulbarga. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn was sent from that place to reinforce the Malik-ut-tujjār. When the two armies met the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Zafar Khān's standards. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn fled and went back to his own territory, and the Malik-ut-tujjār also joined him. These matters will be narrated with greater details in the section about Gujrāt.

ed they are حريدة مهائم. There is no mention in Firishtah of the Malik ut tujjār or any one else being sent in S30 A II to conquer the island of Mahāim. But it appears from Firishtah that towards the end of S33 A II, the Sultān sent the Malik ut-tujjār to purify the land of Kokan (Concan), which is situated on the coast of the Arabian sea, from the taint of all rebels and disturbers, and to destroy all the Rājas, who had gone beyond their bounds. The Malik ut-tujjār carried out the orders within a short time, and sent much tribute to the Sultān, who sent him a special robe of honour and other rewards. The Malik ut tujjār then, in the excess of his zeal, conquered the island of Mahāim (Māhim) which was in the possession of the king of Gujrāt. The latter sent his son Zafar Khān to recover possession of Mahāim, and Sultān Ahmad also sent his son 'Alā ud dīn to reinforce the Malik-ut-tujjār. The two *Shāhzādas* remained encamped on opposite banks of an inlet of the sea, and neither had the courage to cross it. Then 'Alā-ud-dīn became ill and retired some stages, and Zafar Khān attacked the Malik-ut tujjār, and various engagements took place. The Malik-ut-tujjār's brother was taken prisoner, and two other chiefs of the Deccanī army were slain, and that army was completely defeated, and all the elephants and horses and equipages belonging to it fell into the hands of the Gujrātīs. Sultān Ahmad then advanced to reinforce the Malik-ut-tujjār, and Ahmad Shāh of Gujrāt also collected a large army and advanced to meet him. The Deccan army at first surrounded the hill fort of Tambolā in Baglāna, but on the approach of the Gujrāt army raised the siege. The two armies confronted each other for some time, but at last, on the intervention of learned men, peace was restored on the terms that each country should remain in possession of the territories, which it had held from before the war.

Col Briggs in a note says that Mahāim or Māhim is identical with Bombay.

latter's tributaries) arrived, to the effect that Sultān Hūshang, the ruler of Mandū, had, with violence and in great force, invaded his territory and was laying it waste. Sultān Ahmad marched by successive stages to that country. He had not, however, yet arrived there when news came that Naisingh Rāy had removed the yoke of allegiance to the Sultān (i.e., Ahmad Shāh), and had submitted to Sultān Hūshang. Sultān Ahmad Shāh, therefore, turned the rein of his attention, and halted at a place three stages behind, as he did not wish to prolong a war with Musalmāns. (Another) account is this, that Sultān Ahmad had besieged the fort of Kehīla when the Rāy summoned Sultān Hūshang to his aid, and agreed to pay him three *lākhs* of *tanlas* daily towards his expenses. Sultān Hūshang arrived near and Sultān Ahmad, raising the siege, halted at a place three stages further back. Then Sultān Hūshang pursued him along those three stages and raised the dust of disturbance. The next day when the fire of battle blazed up, and the field of bloodshed became hot and streams of blood began to flow from the opposing armies, Sultān Ahmad came out of ambush, with two thousand five hundred well tried warriors, and fell on the centre of Sultān Hūshang's army and in accordance with the words that the beginner (or the aggressor) is the oppressor or is to blame, the army of Mandū was routed. The harem of Sultān Hūshang with all its inmates fell into the hands of the army of the Dakin. Sultān Ahmad with great generosity kept his army back from pursuit, and after some days, sent the inmates of Hūshang's harem back to Mandū, after making all arrangements for them, with an escort of five hundred horsemen, and after sharing the plunder, divided the country among the *jāgīrdār amīrs*.

At the time of returning, when they arrived in the city of ²Bīdar,

Khān, the grandson of Isma'il Fath, respectively, and the centre under Shāhzāda 'Alā ud-dīn. He placed four hundred elephants in different groups, and himself with three thousand selected horsemen and twelve elephants remained in ambush. Sultān Hūshang arrived with seventeen thousand horsemen, and before he could arrange his troops, the battle began, and Sultān Hūshang was defeated, as mentioned in the text.

¹ This is the battle referred to in the latter part of the last note.

² The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. call it *سهر بدر*, the city of Badar or Bīdar, but Firūshah in the corresponding passage says *و سلطان در همان یورس چون*

they found the ground verdant and the fields pleasing to the heart and the Sultān selected the place for his capital and at the moment fixed by the astrologers laid the foundation brick of the citadel in the ground and divided it among the *amirs* and for the palace made a plan of a grand mansion. After its completion the poet who had accompanied him in the journey composed verses to be used as inscriptions on it. Shaikh Āzūrī who was with him in that expedition wrote some couplets which were inscribed on the gate

Couplets

Oh brave! such a palace strong that for its grandeur great
The sky itself is the threshold of its gates sublime
The sky could not say that this transgresses courtesy's rule

¹ 'Tis the palace of the world emperor Ahmad Shāh Bahman

The writer of the *Tarikh Bahmanī Wal ahadat Alia* says that the Sultan gave Shaikh Āzūrī a reward consisting of twelve thousand packages of stuffs

When the country of the Deccan was purified of the weeds of all enemies and came into the uncontested possession of Sultan Ahmad

بحرالی حصار بیدار from which it appears that the city or fortress of Bidar is referred to. *Firishtah* in fulgcs in high praise and loud eulogy of the beauty and salubrity of the place and recalls the fact that it was the site of the ancient Hindu city of Vidarbha the scene of the loves of Nala and Damayanti daughter of Rājā Bhīma Sena of Vidarbha

² There are some variations in the reading of the last line. The MSS have قصر سلطان جهان احمد بهمن ساه است. The lith ed has قصر سلطان جهان بهمنی احمد ساه است. These couplets are also quoted by *Firishtah*. According to him the second line is اسمی سدأ اربانی اسی درگاه است and the last line is identical with that in the MSS of the *Tabaqat*. According to *Firishtah* the reward paid to Shaikh Āzūrī was forty thousand white *tangas* each of them being one *tola* of silver besides twenty thousand more paid to him for the expenses of his journey as he was then about to return to his own country *Khurasan*. It appears also that Shaikh Āzūrī wrote the Bahman nām a chronicle of the Bahman dynasty in verse which he continued to write even after his return to *Khurasan* and after him Mulla Nazārī and Mulla Sāmānī and others continued it

According to *Firishtah* the fort or citadel of Ahamadābad Bidar which was the name given to the new capital was finished in 836 A H 1439 A D

he, in the year 835 A H marched to capture the fort of ¹Tanbūl, which is situated on the boundary of Gujrāt and arriving near it by successive marches, surrounded it. When the siege had been prolonged for two years, Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt, at last with great amity and courtesy sent an emissary with this message "If this *faqīr* had been present at the (wedding²) festivities of Shāhzāda 'Alā-ud-dīn, he (Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī) would have shown him some courtesy. It is now the prayer of the *faqīr*, that in place of that courtesy, he would leave this fort in the possession of its owner". Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī turning from the high way of generosity and the path of politeness, began to take the course of having a consultation on the matter. Some of his *vazīrs* said that the right of gift can only be exercised, if the fort comes into his (i.e., the Sultān's) possession, while another body said that the prayer of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī should be honoured with the courtesy of acceptance. The Sultān preferred the first opinion, and sent a reply, that when the fort should come into his possession, it would be made over to his (Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī's) servants. The latter was enraged on receiving this reply, and sent a large body of troops to reinforce the garrison of the fort, and when this news reached the ear of Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, he withdrew his forces from the foot

¹ Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that after the defeat of K̤half Hasan in his attack on Māhim, Sultān Ahmad collected a large army, and Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt also did the same, and came forward to meet him. The Deccan army at first besieged the fort of مديول [which looks like Mabiūl, Col Briggs says that "the Deccanis in the first instance laid siege to a hill fort, (in a footnote Tembola) in Buglana"], which was in the possession of the adherents of Sultān Ahmad Shāh Gujrātī, but when the latter came to the neighbourhood, he raised the siege and the two armies remained facing each other for a long time, neither party daring to commence the fight, till at last the learned men in the two armies intervened, and peace was concluded, each Sultān being satisfied with his own possessions, and neither was to attempt to seize any part of the other's dominion. Firishtah refers to the slightly different versions of the affair given in the Tārīkh-i Alfī and other histories.

The Cambridge History of India (see p. 401) calls the fort Bhaul on the Gīrnā, which was held for Gujrāt by Malik Sa'ādat. In p. 299 in the chapter which contains the history of Gujrāt and Khāndesh apparently the same fortress was called Ba'tuol which it was said there was gallantly defended by Malik Sa'ādat, an officer of Gujrāt.

of the fort and the Gujrat army also halted some distance behind. The Sultan having removed the dream of capturing the fort from his head went to Gulbarga. The writer of the *Kitab-i Bahaduri* has narrated these transactions in a different manner. If the great God so wills it the pen of the writer will describe it in the section about the Sultans of Gujrat.

¹In the year 838 A H an illness overtook the person of the Sultan and with a sound resolution and true intention he repented of all his offences and sins and gave counsel and direction to his eldest son Sultan Ala ud din in the presence of the *amirs* and *ia'irs*. He then spoke thus to the *amirs*. I have this hope from you that you will pray for the absolution of my sins to the great God. I am hoping that as in my time the hand of tyranny was too short to reach the skirts of the oppressed and helpless so the great and holy

¹ The following incidents which occurred in 836 and 837 A H and which are mentioned by Firishtah have not been referred to by Nizam ud din. (1) the completion of the city of Ahmadabad Bidar in 836 A H and (2) the execution by order of Sultan Ahmad of his nephew Shir Khān at whose instigation he had caused Firūz Shah to be strangled to death and whose continued existence appeared to be likely to be the cause of his son being deprived of the empire. This also was in 836. And in 837 A H Hushang Shah of Malwa seeing the hostility between the Sultans of the Dakin and of Gujrat invaded the territory of Narsingh Ray and the latter was slain in battle and Hushang Shāh seized the fort of Kehrla. Then Sultān Ahmad advanced towards Kehrla when Nasir Khān of Asir intervened and peace was concluded on the condition that Kehrla should belong to Sultān Hushang and Berar to Sultan Ahmad. After that Ahmad Shah marched into Talangāna and after his return he ordered Sh r Malik to be thrown under the feet of an elephant. This was mentioned by Nizam ud din in the beginning of his account of Sultan Ahmad's reign. Firishtah also gives a rather long account of Sultān Ahmad's veneration for learned and holy people and of his sending emissaries to Shah Niamat ul lah of Kirman and the latter's sending one of his favourite disciples Mulla Qutb ud din and later on his grandson Mir Nur ul lah.

After Shah Niamat ul lah's death his son Shah Khān ul lah came to the Deccan with his family and his sons Shah Habib ul lah and Shah Muhibb ul lah. Shah Habib ul lah married a daughter of Sultān Ahmad Shah and Shah Muhibb ul lah a daughter of Sultan Ala ud din and they attained to great distinction. One of them was distinguished as a military commander and received the title of Ghāz and the town of Bīr and the surrounding country as his *jagir*.

God would forgive my offences' He delivered his life to the creator of life between sunset and the time of sleeping at night on the 20th of Rajab with the text of the unity of God on his tongue. The period of his reign was twelve years and nine months and twenty-four days

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN, SON OF AHMAD SHĀH

When on the 29th of Rajab of the afore mentioned year, (he) sat on the place of his father, he gave himself the title of 'Alā ud-dīn Shāh He devoted all his energy on the strengthening of the rule of justice and of the foundations of equity and he placed the weak and infirm in the cradle of safety, peace and repose Therefore, of a necessity the great and holy God gave him his help and aid day after day, and in the very beginning of his youth he 'acquired great fame for experience and knowledge of affairs He entrusted the reins of the management (literally binding and loosening) of all affairs to the wise hand of ⁶ Dilāwar Khān, who had the title of Khān Ā'azam Khān

¹ The date of Sultān Ahmad's death is the 20th Rajab, according to the MSS as well as the lith ed The period of his reign, according to the MSS, is twelve years and nine months and twenty four days The lith ed has only twenty days According to Firishtah the date was the 28th Rajab 838 A H , and this is probably correct as the date of the accession of 'Ala ud-dīn is put down in the Tabaqāt as the 29th Rajab Firishtah does not give the length of the reign Col Briggs says in a note that the date on his tomb in Bidar is 839, the year probably in which the mausoleum was completed

² In the heading of the narrative of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn's reign, the word ^سson (of) is left out in the lith ed , but is in both MSS

³ The MSS as well as the lith ed have Sultān Ahmad Shāh but this is clearly a mistake, and I have corrected it to 'Alā-ud-dīn Shāh

⁴ There are slight differences in the readings One MS has ^{سہرتی}سہرتی ^{ہم}ہم ^{یافتہ}یافتہ ^{کردہ}کردہ , the other omits the word ^{عظم}عظم , while the lith ed has ^{سہرتی}سہرتی ^{ہم}ہم ^{یافتہ}یافتہ I have adopted ^{سہرتی}سہرتی ^{ہم}ہم ^{یافتہ}یافتہ

⁵ This agrees with Firishtah, who however says that Dilāwar Khān was made Vakil ush-Shāhī He also says that Khwāja-i Jahān Astrābādī was made Vazīr Kul, (Minister-in-charge of all departments), and 'Imād ul-mulk Ghuri was made Amīr ul-Umā.

Sultān sent Khālf Hasan Malik-ut-tujjār to oppose Nasir Khān. After the parties had met, Nasir Khān fled, and went back to Asir. Malik-ut-tujjār pursued him as far as Asir, and after raiding and laying waste the part of that territory returned, and in the same year Nasir Khān became the subject of the inevitable (*i e*, died), and according to another statement, this happened in the year 840 A H.

As at the time of dividing his kingdom among the princes, Ahmad Shāh had placed Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān in charge of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, the latter wanted to give him a proper training and to raise him to the higher grades of leadership and greatness, and in order to carry out this intention, ¹ he sent him with an army

Khālf Hasan levied large quantities of gold and gems from the citizens of Burhānpūr, and then devastated the country around, and returning to Burhānpūr burnt down the palace and dug up its foundations, and then gave out that he was marching back to the Deccan, but instead of doing so, he marched rapidly during the night, and appeared before Lāling with four thousand horsemen. Nasir Khān, thinking that Khālf Hasan's soldiers must be quite exhausted, met him with twelve thousand horsemen and a large body of infantry, but he was completely routed, and many of his chief men and the rebel *amīrs* of Berār were slain. Khālf Hasan then returned to Ahmadābad Bidar, and he was received with great honour and distinction.

I have said in the beginning of this note, that the campaign against Nasir Khān, which is mentioned by Nizām-ud dīn as having occurred in 839, is not mentioned by Firishtah, but on further consideration, I think that the two campaigns, namely that mentioned by Nizām ud-dīn and that described by Firishtah as having occurred in 841, both refer to the same series of events. Khālf Hasan commanded the Deccan army in both, and he is said, in both, to have pursued Nasir Khān to Burhānpūr and to have laid that place waste.

¹ Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān was sent with 'Imād-ul-mulk Ghūrī, who was made *Amīr-ul-umra*, and Khawāja Jahān against Bījānagar, as the Rāy had not sent five years' tribute. They marched into Canāra, and began to plunder and ravage the country. The Rāy in great distress sent the tribute with valuable presents. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Mudkal, some discontented officers told Muhammad Khān that the Sultān should either place him by his own side on the *masnad*, and allow him to act with himself in the management of affairs, or should give him half the kingdom. The Shāhzāda was deceived by these words, and he tried to induce 'Imād-ul-mulk and Khawāja Jahān to join him. They refused to do so, whereupon they were

to conquer Bijanagar ¹Malik Imad ud din Churi who was in those parts from before the time when the Shahzada was sent when he heard that the Shahzada had arrived at the bank of the river Krishna joined his army without any hesitation As the Shahzada was not satisfied with the fact that the kingdom should belong to the Sultan and was waiting for an opportunity he put Malik Imad ud din who was perfectly innocent to death and raised the standard of revolt and hostility The Sultan on receiving information of these occurrences advanced to punish Muhammad Khan When the armies met victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Ala ud din's standards Muhammad Khan frightened and depressed fled with shame and disgrace

Couplet

Gainst thy benefactor if thou dost transgress
If thou art high as the sky low thy head will fall

The Sultan kept his troops back from pursuit on account of the relation of kindred and halted where he was At this time an

both put to death The rebels then collected an army with the help of the tribute obtained from Bijanagar and took possession of Mudkal Raichore Sholapur and Naldurg Col Briggs also mentions Bijapur but I cannot find it in the lith ed of Firishtah Mr Sewell also mentions Shahzāda Muhammad Khan's rebellion (see page 41 of his book) He says that the prince took Mudkal Raichur Sholapur and Bijapur and Naldurg from the Sultan's governors The Sultan was in great grief for the murder of Imād ul malk who he said was like a father to him He then advanced against Muhammad Khan In the battle which followed the Sultan was victorious and most of the men who had incited Muhammad Khan were taken prisoners while Muhammad Khan himself fled to the hills and jungles Ala ud din returned to Ahmadabad Bidar He pardoned the rebel leaders and wrote admonitory letters to his brother and induced him to come back to him and after showing him much kindness conferred on him the fort of Raichur and the neighbouring country in Tilang which had been previously given to prince Daud who was now dead and sent him there

¹ The wording of the sentence in the MSS as well as in the lith ed appears to me to be somewhat illogical It is *فیل ار رفسداس ملک عماد الدین عوری کہ* The proper form of the sentence would be *ملک عماد الدین عوری کہ فیل ار رفسداس ساء رادۃ دران سرحد بود حوں سند کہ وی* *کنار اب کسی رسد* and I have changed the sentence and translated accordingly

uncle of the Sultān, who had been in the army of Muhammad Khān was brought before him. The Sultān pardoned his offence, and granted favours to him. When he was again firmly seated on the *masnad* of government, he sent a *farmān* containing much good advice to Muhammad Khān to the following effect: that God the ruler of the world and all who are in it chooses whomsoever He likes among the created beings, and as the rule of eternal grace draws the line of distinction on the page of the condition of that chosen one, He entrusts the keys of success and greatness in the world into the grasp of his power. The tree of grandeur which is watered by the stream of Divine favour never receives any injury from the whirlwinds of calamity, and the sublime mansion which is raised by eternal grace is not endangered by the engines of deceit and treachery.

Couplet

One who is made great by Him the sky cannot make him small,

One who is made dear by Him, the world never can wreck.

The result of these comforting arguments is, that one should be satisfied with the justice and grace of God and should not be proud of his own greatness and strength, for the standards of the greatness of such men are always beaten and cast down. It is right and proper that that fortunate brother should not place his foot outside the path of obedience, and the highway of submission, and should not dispute the will of the great and one holy God, and should not break any engagement and agreement, for such things are evil. And specially after having obtained forgiveness from those who are his elders, he should make his excuses for what has happened, and should not let the dust of distress reach his heart, for the screen of pardon has covered them up. I am conferring¹ *Mauzah* Rājūr in the territory of Tilang on him. He should go there without any delay and should draw the goods and chattels of life into that corner of safety, and should no longer run after absurd things. When this *farmān* reached Muhammad Khān, he trod on the path of

¹ The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. have مرمع راجل, *Mauza' Rajal*, but I have changed it to Rājūr.

obedience and submission and went to Rajur and the Sultan returned to the capital

In the year¹ 849 A H Khalf Hasan Arab who bore the title of Malik ut tujjar advanced to capture the fort of Sangesar which is one of the largest fortresses on the sea coast The people of the country relying on the strength of the jungle fastnesses and the difficult paths came forward to give battle The Malik ut tujjar on entering that country first of all seized the fort of a Raja who had the name of³ Sarka by the strength of his brave and heroic arms and making Sarka prisoner gave him the choice between death and

¹ The MSS as well as the lith ed have در سده نهم و اربعين و ثمانمائة but this is clearly incorrect Firishtah has سنه اربعين و ثمانمائة 840 A H and as the war with Nasir Khan which arose out of Sultan Ala ud din's love for Ziba Chehra or Peri Chehra who was brought by Dilawar Khan as part of the booty obtained in this expedition and his coldness to his queen Agha Zainab or Malka i Jahan took place in 841 A H the date mentioned by Firishtah namely 840 A H is clearly correct The accounts of the expedition against the Rays of Kokan (Concan) as given by Nizam ud din and Firishtah are altogether different First there is the difference in the date Then Nizam ud din says it was led by Khalf Hasan while according to Firishtah the leader was Dilawar Khan It appears however from Firishtah that Khalf Hasan or Malik ut tujjar was the leader of another expedition into the Concan in 858 A H 1453 A D when he was waylaid and slain in circumstances somewhat similar to those mentioned by Nizam ud din It would appear that the latter has mixed up the two expeditions

The name is سكر Sakar in one MS شنگر Shankar in the other and س Sangesar in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has س Sangesar but Col Briggs has Sonkehar and he says the situation of the place has not been ascertained There is a place called Sangames var in the map attached to Elphinstone's history not far from the coast about half way between Junjira and Gheria which may be the place There is not much difference between the names in the map and in the lith eds of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah The latter only requires a م to be inserted

³ Col Briggs says in a note in page 43 of Vol II of his translation of Firishtah that Sarka or more properly Srky (the Sirkey of the excellent Marratta History) is the name of one of the most ancient families of the Konkan The mother of the present Raja of Satara was of that house I have consulted Grant Duff's History of the Marhattas Sarkay is mentioned in the index with 19 against it but I have not been able to find it in that page or elsewhere

the acceptance of Islām. That deceitful man told him, ¹“You will gain nothing by slaying me, but the difficulties of the road and the great extent of the jungle are known to everybody. If you allow me to live, I shall lead the army, by a road in which not a single thorn will reach the skirts of any horseman.” The Malik-ut-tujjār trusting his words made him the pioneer of the army and its guide, and commenced to traverse that country. Although the leaders of the army told him, that it was not proper to place any reliance on the words of an enemy, he did not pay any attention to their words, and the misleading guide took them along a road the sight of which, would have frightened even a demon. They were at last brought to a place on three sides of which there were hills and jungles, and on the fourth side, a deep ravine of water which flowed into the jungle, and at this place Sarka gave intimation to the enemy, and that midnight about forty thousand foot soldiers fell on them, and Khalf Hasan with a body of Musalmāns became martyrs, and the remnant of the army, with great trouble and privation returned to ²Jālna, which was Khalf Hasan’s place of residence.

¹ According to Firishtah, Sarka offered to guide the Malik-ut-tujjār against Rāy Sangesar, who was in the neighbourhood of fort Gandhāna, and who was his rival. He also said that after defeating him the Malik ut tujjār might make over his territory to Sarka, or to one of the Musalmān *amīns*. Then he (Sarka) would at once accept *Islām*, and be a loyal tributary of the Sultān. The Malik ut tujjār trusting him commenced the journey in 850 A H, when most of the Dakinī and Abyssinian *amīns* deserted him. Sarka took him along a broad and easy road for two days and everybody was highly pleased with him but on the third day he led him along a path which, to quote Firishtah’s language, “was so terrible that for fear of it a tiger would become a tigress”, (which apparently, according to Firishtah, is a very timid creature) “and which was more tortuous than the ringlets of fair ones, and thinner than the sighs of lovers”. The Malik ut tujjār became ill at this time of a bloody flux, and consequently there was very little order in the army, and at nightfall the soldiers lay down where they could. Sarka disappeared, and Sangesar on receiving a message from him came with thirty thousand armed soldiers, and Sarka joined him with his own men, and they slew seven thousand or eight thousand soldiers like so many sheep, and then fell on Khalf Hasan and his five hundred Banu Hasan ‘Arabs and slaughtered them also.

Col Briggs calls Rāy Sangesar of Gandhāna, Sankar Rāy of Kehina.

² Called جاکتا Jākta in the lith ed of Firishtah, where it is described

¹The Dakin *razis* in whose creed enmity to the great was ingrained reported these matters to Sultan Ala ud din in a very

as the *كلا حلف حسن نصري* the residence of *Khalf Hasan Basri* Col Briggs calls the place the town of Chakun and does not say anything about its being the residence of *Khalf Hasan Basri* I have not been able to find Gandhana or Kehlna or Jalna or Jakta in the map but there is a Galna between Dhulia and Maligong but that appears to be too far north and there is a Chacun a short distance to the north of Puna or Poona

¹ The fate of the Saiyyads and other Musalman foreigners (then commonly called *Mughals*) is described in greater detail and somewhat differently by Firishtah According to him some of the *Mughals* said imprudently at the time of going away to Jakta that it was the treachery of the Dakin *amirs* that caused the defeat and death of the Malik ut tujjar and the Saiyyads and that as soon as they would arrive at Jakta they would send petitions to the Sultan stating all the facts The Dakins on hearing this forestalled them and sent representations to the Sultan that *Khalf Hasan* had in spite of their remonstrances gone into the jungles under the guidance of Sarka and thus brought on death and disaster and that the Saiyyads and *Mughals* who had escaped had refused to join them in an expedition against Sarka and the Ray of Sangesar but had gone away to Jakta after speaking ill of the Sultan and it appeared from their acts that they intended to join the Rays of Kohan and create disturbances They sent these reports to Mash r ul mull (Col Briggs calls him Sheer ul mull) who was the greatest enemy of *Khalf Hasan* and he submitted them to the Sultan and reported the acts of the *Mughal* in the worst possible light The Sultan was enraged and without making any enquiry ordered Mashir ul mulk and Nizam ul mulk son of Malik Imād ud din Chūrī who were both thirsting for the blood of the *Mughals* to go and slay the *amirs* who were at Jakta The Saiyyads and *Mughals* on hearing this shut themselves up at Jakta and sent reports stating the true state of things These reports fell into the hands of Mashir ul mulk and were torn up The Saiyyads and *Mughals* then sent other reports by the hands of their old and trusted Hindu servants but these men treacherously made them over to Mashir ul mulk who tore them up also The Saiyyads and *Mughals* having no other alternative fortified themselves in Jakta and collected provision

Mashir ul mulk then summoned the Dakin *amirs* who had deserted from *Khalf Hasan* and in concert with them besieged Jakta and for two months slaughter and bloodshed went on Mash r ul mulk sent repeated petitions to the Sultan that the Saiyyads and *Mughals* were bent on hostility and intended to deliver Jakta up to the Sultan of Gujrat and the Sultan sent repeated *farmāns* directing their total destruction Then the Saiyyads and *Mughals* finding that their provisions were becoming exhausted determined to leave the women and children under a guard in the fort and to march rapidly to

unfavourable light and as the latter had made over the reins of (the management of) affairs into the grasp of power of the *rājās*, those

Ahmadābād Bidai, and explain the facts to the Sultān. Mashīr-ul-mulk and Nizām ul mulk then decided that if the Saiyyads and Mughals did this, they would have to pursue them and a considerable number of them would be slain. They therefore determined on fraud and deceit, and sent a message, that they had reported their helpless condition to the Sultān, and the latter had ordered that there should be no injury to their lives and properties, and they should be allowed to go where they liked. Mashīr-ul mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk swore on the *Quān* to testify to the truth of their statements. The Saiyyads twelve hundred in number and the other Musalmān foreigners thirteen hundred in number then came out of Jākta with their women and children. As they had no beasts of burden, they encamped in front of the fort. The Dakinīs abided by their agreement for three days, but on the fourth day they invited the Saiyyads to the fort and all, except Qāsim Beg Safshukan and Qarā Khān Gurd and Ahmad Ekkatāz in all about three hundred men of rank, accepted it. When they sat down to the feast, armed men attacked them and slew them, and about four thousand Dakinīs attacked all the males who were outside, even the babes at their mothers' breasts, and treated the women with all the insult that their lust and barbarity could provoke. Qāsim Beg and the others who were in camp at a distance of two miles then armed themselves and fled towards the capital. Mashīr-ul-mulk and Nizām ul mulk sent two thousand horsemen under Dāūd Khān to pursue them, and they also sent orders to all *jāgīrdārs* and *raiyats* to intercept and slay them. Qāsim Beg, however, held on his course, only turning round to attack the pursuers when they pressed too close on them. When they arrived at Bir, Dāūd Khān called upon Hasan Khān the *jāgīrdār*, to help him in intercepting and slaying the rebels. Hasan Khān, however, knew Qāsim Beg, who had once saved his life in battle, and replied that if Qāsim Beg had been a rebel, he would have gone over to Gujrāt, which was only three days' journey from the place where they had been. Dāūd Khān then arraved his followers for a drawn battle and Qāsim Beg met him. Dāūd Khān was at this time hit by two arrows and was slain, but his men continued to fight vigorously, and Qāsim Beg was in great difficulty. Then Hasan Khān appeared with his men. Qāsim Beg, thinking that they were coming to reinforce Dāūd Khān's men, was seriously alarmed at this new danger, but Hasan Khān's men told his men that they were coming to help them. Then they became more hopeful and defeated the Dakinīs, who went back to Jākta carrying the corpse of Dāūd Khān with them.

Qāsim Beg and Hasan Khān now sent representations to the Sultān, who sent for Qāsim Beg. When the latter appeared before the Sultān, and explained matters to him, he ordered Mustafa Khān, the head of the political department who had destroyed the petitions of the Saiyyads and Mughals to be beheaded,

deceitful men sent Raja Rustam who had the title of Nizam ul mulk and Silar Hamza who bore the title of Mashir ul mull with a blood thirsty army ¹ towards (or to seize ² *ba qasd*) Jalna. When Nizam ul mull and Mashir ul mulk arrived in the vicinity of Jalna they gave assurances of safety to twelve hundred Saiyyads of true and pure descent and a thousand other foreigners and made them expectant and hopeful by strong and well confirmed oaths and gave them valuable robes of honour and sent them to their places of residence. On the following day they arranged a great entertainment and concealed three thousand men inside the house after putting ornaments on their dresses and invited the Saiyyads to the feast and showing them all honour and respect made them sit down. They took thirty of them outside on the pretext of giving them their food and poured the *sharbat* of martyrdom into the gullet of each one of them. So that twelve hundred Saiyyads who were distinguished by the purity of their descent were sent to the grade of martyrdom. In no time whatever since the time of Yazid the impious and the accursed had such a calamity occurred.

Couplet

Iron and steel from the same mine come out
But the one a mirror becomes and the other
a donkey's shoe

He also appointed Qasim Beg in place of Khalif Hasan and made him the commander of the army of Daulatābad and Jūnir. The other leaders of the *Mughals* were also rewarded and fresh *Mughal* levies were ordered to be raised. Mashir ul mulk and Nizam ul mulk and all their confederates were punished. They were ordered to be brought from Jakta to Ahmadābād Badar on foot with chains and fetters on them. The houses and property of Mashir ul mulk and Nizam ul mulk were appropriated to the Sultan's use so that their children wandered about homeless and starving. Besides this Mashir ul mulk and Nizam ul mulk were afflicted with leprosy in the course of the year.

¹ There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS and the lith ed have *بعض حاله* as I have in the text. But the other MS has *بعضه حاله* i.e. to the town of Jalna.

The Caliph Yazid who made the attack on Husain at Karbala. There are some differences in the readings. One MS substitutes *عصرى* for *مهدى* which is in the other MSS and in the lith ed. The lith ed has *مطرود* after *مليون* but this is omitted in both MSS and both MSS substitute *لن نوع مصيب* for *لن نوع واعد*.

¹ In their old age, both Mashīr-ul-mulk and Nizām-ul-mulk became afflicted with leprosy, so that (it may be imagined what would happen to them) in the after life Oh! holy God, such a father that he cast his own *razī* under the foot of an elephant for insulting one Saiyyad, and such a son that he caused the massacre of twelve hundred Saiyyads without any reason whatever

² As the Rāys of Kokan (Concan) vaunted of their independence, and did not make their submission, the Sultān nominated Dilāwar Khān to conquer that country, after conferring on him a special robe of honour, and sent *farmāns* to the *amīrs* on the frontier that they should collect their men and should join Dilāwar Khān. When the latter arrived at the town of ³Kankūla, ⁴he sent Asad Khān and

¹ Contrary to this Firishtah says *و بروایت طبقات محمود شاهی شیرالملک دکن و نظام الملک عوزی در همان سال بعلت برص گرفتار گشته*

² It appears to me that Nizām-ud-dīn describes here events, which, according to Firishtah, happened before the invasion by and defeat of Nasīr Khān, and the invasion of the Konkan by Khalf Hasan, and the latter's death (See the early part of note 1, p. 61) It may be mentioned here that Nizām-ud-dīn's account differs from Firishtah's in three main particulars (1) As already mentioned Nizām-ud-dīn places the expedition at a date long posterior to that of Firishtah. Firishtah says that Dilāwar Khān started on the expedition on the Nauroz (Muharram 1st) of 840 A.H. Nizām-ud-dīn gives no date, but he mentions it after the death of Khalf Hasan and connected events, which took place according to Firishtah in 858 A.H., though Nizām-ud-dīn unfortunately does not give any date, (2) Firishtah says that Dilāwar Khān sent the daughter of the Rāja of Sangesar or Sonkehr, who received the name of Zībā Chehra, and became the cause of Nasīr Khān's invasion of Berār, and his subsequent defeat. Nizām-ud-dīn says that Dilāwar Khān sent the daughters of two Rāys, *viz*, those of Sangesar and Rāhal, but he does not say anything about what happened to them after they arrived in the Sultān's camp, and (3) Nizām-ud-dīn says vaguely that the Sultān turned against Dilāwar Khān at the instigation of envious people, but Firishtah says, that the Sultān learnt that Dilāwar Khān had received bribes from the Rājas of Konkan, and had not done his best to reduce their fortresses. Firishtah also says that after Dilāwar Khān had retired, the eunuch Dastūr ul-mulk was placed in charge of affairs

³ Kankūla does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. He only mentions according to the lith. ed. the Rāys of Rāhal and Sangesar. Col Briggs calls them the Rāys of Sonkehr and Rairee. As to Sangesar or Sonkehr see p. 61, note 2

⁴ There are differences in the reading. One MS. has *را سبب، کر فرستاد نا* the other has *ولایت را حراب کردند* the lith. ed. agrees with the reading of the first MS.

Fulad Khan and Safdar Khan and they devastated the country and burnt down houses and other structures. The Ray of Sangesar who was the chief of the country owing to great weakness and exhaustion sent an emissary to Dilawar Khan and promised to send a large tribute with his daughter, and also engaged that henceforward they would not place their feet outside the path of obedience. Dilawar Khan agreed to his prayer and sent the Ray's daughter and the heavy tribute to the capital and himself advanced to capture the fort of ¹Rahal which was one of the most important forts of that country. On arrival at that neighbourhood Safdar Khan and Fulad Khan and a body of men commenced to plunder the wealth of the country and to destroy it. The inhabitants availing themselves of a fit opportunity made a sudden attack and in that action the brother and the son of Dilawar Khan became martyrs. Dilawar Khan with the help of the great and holy God collected his soldiers and dispersed the assailants and made many men food for the blood drinking swords. After repeated battles and much bloodshed the Ray of that district spread the bed of excuses and sent his own daughter with a large quantity of tribute to Dilawar Khan. The latter pardoned his offences and returned to the presence of the Sultan and was distinguished by kindnesses and favours. When the greatness and power of Dilawar Khan reached their zenith the disposition of the Sultan turned against him at the instigation of envious people and so he withdrew his hand from the Sultan's service and retired into a corner of safety.

As the Ray of Bijanagar got information of this delicate state of affairs and knew that the Sultan would not march in person he in the ³year 847 A H plundered certain *parganas* on the frontier and

¹ The name looks like رابل or رابل in the MSS. It is رابل in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed also has رابل and I have accordingly retained رابل. Col Briggs has Rairee.

² There are differences of readings here also. One MS has معدر حانرا و مولاد حمعی که در بهت اموال و عارب ارواح شروع کردند the other MS has معدر حان و مولاد حان و جمع که در بهت اموال و عارب ارواح شروع کردند the lith ed has معدر حان و مولاد حان و حمعی که در بهت اموال و عارب ارواح شروع کردند. The readings of the 2nd MS and the lith ed appear to me to be nearly correct but the word که should be omitted and a و inserted before حمعی in the lith ed.

³ This campaign is mentioned both by Firishtah and by Mr Sewell. The date given by Nizām ud dīn 847 A H (1443 A D) is correct but the campaign

carried away cattle and other goods and chattles. The Sultān, having received information of this unfortunate occurrence, advanced

took place, while the Malik-ut tujjār was yet alive, and he took part in it as will be seen later on, so that although the date is correct, the chronological order of Nizām ud-dīn's account is incorrect. Firishtah commences his account by saying that the Rāy of Bijānagar convened a council of chiefs and Brahmans, to consider how it was, that in spite of the fact that his country, the Carnātic, was larger in extent, and had more population and revenue than the Bahmanī kingdom, the ruler of the latter was always victorious in all campaigns. The Brahmans, like the Brahmans of Lakshman Sen's court at once quoted their Sāstras and said that according to these, they were to be subject to the Musalmāns for thirty thousand years. Others said that the Musalmāns had stronger horses and better archers, and the Rāy ordered that Musalmāns should be enlisted in his service, and *jāgīrs* should be granted to them, and a mosque should be erected in Bijānagar for their use, and no one should interfere with them in the exercise of their religion, and a copy of the *Qurān* should be placed in front of his throne, so that the Musalmāns might salute it. He also ordered his soldiers to be trained in archery, so that he soon had ten thousand Musalmāns and sixty thousand *lāfī* horsemen, who all had knowledge of archery, and three lakhs of infantry. He then crossed the Tungābhadrā, and conquered the fort of Mudkal and sent his sons to besiege Rājore and Bankāpūr, and stationed himself on the bank of the Krīshnā, and his soldiers raided as far as Saghir and Bijāpūr. Sultān 'Alā-ud dīn ordered his forces to assemble, and when fifty thousand cavalry and sixty thousand infantry were ready, the Sultān at an auspicious moment marched out with artillery and other munitions of war. Deo Rāy advanced to the fort of Mudkal. The Sultān sent Khalif Hasan Basrī, Malik-ut tujjār, with the army of Daulatābād against the sons of Deo Rāy, and Khān Zamān with the army of Bijāpūr and Khān Ā azam with that of Berār against Deo Rāy himself. Khalif Hasan advanced to Rājore and fought with the elder son of Deo Rāy, so that he was wounded and had to flee. He then advanced towards Bankāpūr, and he had not yet reached that place, when the younger son of the Rāy fled and joined his father. Then there was a great battle near Mudkal, and both sides suffered heavy losses, the Musalmāns suffering more than the Hindūs. Then a second battle was fought and the Musalmāns were victorious, and the elder son of the Rāy, who had fled from Mudkal was killed by a spear thrown at him by Khān Zamān. The Hindūs fled panic struck into the fort of Mudkal, and Fakhr-ul-mulk Dehlavī and his brother pursuing them closely, entered the fort, were captured, and were taken before Deo Rāy. The Sultān then sent a message to the Rāy, that if these two men were killed, he would slay two lakhs of Hindūs to avenge their deaths. Deo Rāy then sent a message to the Sultān that if he would in future refrain from attacking his country, he would send an annual tribute, and return

towards the country of Bijanagar. He distributed large quantities of arms and many horses (among his soldiers) and advancing rapidly besieged the fort of Mudali. As all appliances for the capture of the fort were prepared and the garrison saw death before their eyes the Ray of Bijanagar on account of great misery and wretchedness sent an emissary and prayed for the pardon of his offences and entered into an agreement that he should send tribute every year and ¹he should at once pay in cash whatever the Sultan should have expended on this expedition. The Sultan then drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences and returned to his capital and he (i.e. the Ray) paid whatever he had agreed to pay and thus gained safety. The Sultan arranged a great entertainment in the vicinity of the capital and conferred distinctions on the *amirs* bestowing on them robes of honour and other favours. He then stayed for some time at the seat of the empire.

As Sikandar Khan Bukhari had a great share in the rebellion of Shahzida Muhammad Khan and although after that Sultan

the two prisoners uninjured and never transgress the rules of obedience. The Sultan agreed to the proposals. Deo Ray sent the two *amirs* and the arrears of tribute of some years and valuable presents and the Sultan also sent presents and then returned to his capital.

This account abridged from *Firishlah* contains more facts than the vague narrative in the *Tabaqat*. Col Briggs calls Fakhr ul mulk Mashur ul mulk. Mr Sewell also mentions the incident but he does not give their names but calls them two chief Muhammadan officers (page 6). He also says that the campaign must have been of short duration since while it began in 847 A.H. (May 1st 1443 A.D. to April 19th 1444 A.D.) according to *Firishlah* it was over before December 1443 when Abdur Razzak (who came as ambassador from Persia to Calicut and Vijayanagar) left Vijayanagar. (Page 77.)

¹ The words which I have translated "would pay in cash" are in the MSS *بعد حواب گوید* and *حواب گوید* and in the lith. ed. *بعد حواب گوید* the meaning of which I am told is "to pay cash on the spot".

Firishlah's account of the rebellion of Sikandar Khan Bukhari is as follows. In 874 A.H. the Sultan had an ulcer in his leg which his physicians could not cure and he therefore came very rarely out of the palace and the report of his death was spread about. Upon this Jalal Khan Bukhari son in law of Sultan Ahmad Shah who had *jagirs* in *sarkar* Nalkonda in Tilang believing that the Sultan was dead took possession of a large tract of country in his neighbourhood and wanted to make his son Sikandar Khan a ruler of that

'Alā-ud-dīn had, after his victory, pardoned his offences he was always afraid and had suspicions of the Sultān's anger and could not be assured in the matter of the latter's favourable disposition towards him. At last some evil-disposed persons informed him in the months of the year 960 A H, of some words which they told him had been uttered by the Sultān. Sikandar Khān now, having no other alternative, resolved upon acting ungratefully, and sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī, ruler of Malwā, and persuaded him to attempt the conquest of the country of Berār. Sultān Mahmūd then advanced to Berār from Mandū, and Sikandar Khān advanced with one thousand

tract of country. The Khān Ā'azam had also at that time died, and there was no one of high rank in Tilang, and the *amīrs* of that province wanted to make Sikandar Khān the Sultān there. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, in spite of his illness began to collect troops to march against him. Upon that Jalāl Khān held a council and decided that he should hold that country, while Sikandar Khān should march to Māhur, and take possession of it, so that the attention of the Sultān should be distracted between the two rebellions. The Sultān sent a *qaul-nāma* (or agreement) to Sikandar Khān, but as he had had a large share in the rebellion of Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān, and had committed the present acts of hostility, he could not in any way be assured of his safety, and so he sent a message to Sultān Mahmūd Shāh Khālījī of Mālwa, to the effect that Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn had become ill and was dead, but his *vazīrs* had for their own purposes kept the matter in concealment, and that if he would now march in that direction, Berār and Tilang would without any dispute come into his possession. Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī after consulting the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr started in 860 A H on his march to Berār. Sikandar Khān advanced for a few stages and met him with a thousand horsemen. Sultān 'Alā ud dīn cancelled his expedition to Tilang, and sent Khwāja Mahmūd Gīlānī known as Gāwān against Jalāl Khān. He also sent the army of Berār to meet the ruler of Burhānpūr, who had advanced to support Sultān Mahmūd, and sent Qāsim Beg Saf Shikan with the army of Daulatābād to meet Sultān Mahmūd, and himself, seated in a *palkī*, followed at a distance of five *karōhs*. Sultān Mahmūd finding that Sultān 'Alā-ud dīn was alive, and was advancing to meet him returned to his own country. He left an officer under the pretence of assisting Sikandar Khān, but with secret instructions to seize him with his treasures, and to bring him to Mandū, if he attempted to escape. Sikandar Khān however received information of this, and joined his father at Nālkonda, which Khwāja Gāwān was then besieging. Then both father and son obtained assurance of safety from the Sultān through the Khwāja, and surrendered the fort to the latter. They then came to the Sultān, and again obtained Nālkonda as their *jāgīr*.

horsemen for a few stages and joined him ¹ They then besieged Mahur and when a long time passed and the siege was protracted Sultan Ala ud din came with a large army to help the garrison and when he arrived in the vicinity of Mahur Sultan Mahmud marched away at night and retired towards Mandu Sultan Ala ud din honoured the *thanadar* of Mahur with the title of Fakhr ul mulk and conferred many favours on him and confirmed him in the government of Mahur and its dependencies in accordance with previous custom He made arrangements for the government of that part of his kingdom and then returned towards the capital On the way Sikandar came before him with his head hanging down in shame and with a shroud tied to his shoulder The Sultan on account of the great benevolence which was ingrained in his nature covered his offences with the skirt of pardon and exalted him with a special robe of honour

They say that Sultan Ala ud din was extremely patient and forbearing and he read the public prayer himself and praised

¹ This and some of the facts mentioned later have no place in Firishtah's account given in the preceding note

² These incidents are mentioned by Firishtah also in his appreciation of Sultan Ala ud din's character and attainments He says People say that Sultan Ala ud din was fluent and eloquent and knew Persian well and he had also acquired some knowledge of the sciences Sometimes on Fridays and the two *Ids* he went to the *Juma masjid* and ascending the pulpit he read the public prayers and he praised himself with these titles (the titles agree with those in the text but the name instead of being احمد ساء الولی ابن محمد ساء بهمنی (علاء الدین بن عظم السلاطین احمد ساء ولی بهمنی is محمد ساء بهمنی Firishtah goes on to say that one day an Arab merchant who had sold horses for the king's use the payment for which had been delayed by the officers of the household being present at the foot of the pulpit when the Sultan spoke the words immediately stood up and said By God thou art neither just nor merciful nor patient nor liberal but art a tyrant and a liar who has slaughtered the Prophet's true and holy descendants and yet dares to speak these words on the pulpits of the Musalmans The Sultan being much affected wept aloud and immediately paid the price of the horses and said those who have reviled me in this world and the next as being like Yazid will never escape the fire of the wrath of God He then went to the palace and never came out of it till his coffin was borne out The fact of the Sultan's owing money to the Arab and ordering its immediate payment introduces an element of bathos

himself with the following title, *viz*, the just, the forbearing, the merciful, the benevolent Sultān over the worshippers of God, the great 'Alā-ud-dunyā-wad-dīn Ahmad Shāh, son of Ahmad Shāh the Walī, son of Muhammad Shāh, Al-Bahmanī Saiyyad Ajal, to whose great ancestors the position of the honourable *naqīb* of holy *Mashhad* had been entrusted, and who was much grieved at the slaughter of the Saiyyads at Jālna, 10-c on a day on which Sultān 'Alā ud dīn recited these titles, in praise of himself, and said, "by God thou art a great liar, thou art not just, nor forbearing nor merciful but hast slaughtered the holy and pure descendants of the Prophet and thou darest to speak these words on the pulpits of the Moslems" Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn came out of the *masjid*, and made no protest of any kind. This story is a clear proof of his forbearance.

¹ In the year 862 A H, in accordance with the Divine decree, a severe illness fell on the person of the Sultān. When he became hopeless of surviving,² he sent one day for Humāyūn Khān who was the most highly cultured and the eldest of his sons, and said, "Oh pupil of my eye! the time has come when I should, with an open brow, accept the summons of death, but there are some royal pearls which I have received as an inheritance from my great ancestors and which I have treasured and kept concealed in the oyster-shell of my breast, and their beauty and elegance are such, that wisdom the appraiser of gems, who is possessed of perfection of intelligence, has to confess its ignorance in the matter of their price, and the speech of the word-stringing pen, in spite of its fluency and eloquence, has to acknowledge its impotence in describing their advantages and

into what would otherwise have been a scene of stern rebuke. This is absent from the version of the incident as told by Nizām ud-dīn.

¹ According to Firishtah, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn had an ulcer on his leg in 857 A H, and it was of such a serious kind that reports of his death were circulated, and the rebellion of Sikandar Khān took place, and although the Sultān was able to proceed against Sultān Mahmūd of Mālwa, he had to do so seated in a *palkī*. The malady appears to have gone on, and brought on the Sultān's death in 862 A H.

² Firishtah does not say anything about 'Alā-ud-dīn's precepts and advice to Humāyūn Khān. The latter received the title of *Zālim* or the tyrant, so Nizām-ud dīn's description of him as ذال among 'Alā-ud dīn's sons, does not appear to me to be appropriate.

benefits My paternal affection and my great love for my good and able son compel me that I should make heavy his ear of intelligence with those pearls of advice and those gems of precept

Couplet

I tell thee with such eloquence as I have
Thou mayest benefit from my words or mayest be wroth

¹ DIRECTIONS AND PRECEPTS

Oh well beloved son¹ as the time has come when you the light of my eye and of the empire should sit on the throne of greatness it is right that in matters connected with the people you should not pass any orders without a valid reason and clear evidence and should not grant a *farman* without deliberation and examination of the policy and certainty (about it) for the disadvantage of it would be greater than the advantage You should also keep the affairs of rule and government pure and clean from the stains of the words or self interested persons for those peoples sometimes draw into the net of punishment the gems of the good deeds of men and show on the platform of appearance beneficent acts and virtuous deeds in an ugly garb and a sinister shape You should always keep wicked and dishonest men and criminals and disturbers in subjection and misery otherwise men would be bold in acting dishonestly and wickedly and justice which is the foundation of all morality and on which the laws of the *Shara* and the rules of government are based will be lost from amongst men Further² you should not allow men who try to create disturbances to come near you and should hold the words of these men who are destined to end in adversity to be entirely destitute of credence You should

¹ The reading in the MSS is البصا والنصائح as I have it in the text In the lith ed it is ملك سلطان علاء الدين بدير حود هيمان حان كرده اند
One MS inserts the word وابسته between حوكومت and بران

² There are different readings One MS has و دنگر نام و ساعى بالعسا را the other has و دنگر علو نام و ساعى etc as in the other The lith ed has و نام ساعى با تعداد بحدود راه ددهد All three appear to me to be incorrect but the first would be correct if وساعى is changed to ساعى

not also, for a few words or for a suspicion, which may enter your mind, throw an innocent man into the narrow places of danger and the ravine of fear

You should also in matters of great and small difficulties consult men of intelligence and wisdom and in the solution of intricate matters and the discovery of difficult things recognise them as just judges and impartial *Qāzīs*, for wise men have said He who consults, will never repent, as two opinions are (always) better than one, and also you should always consider justice and equity to be the two wings of greatness, and the two arms of the empire. In all matters you should not miss the path of justice and the high way of equity You should also try to draw the hearts of your subjects and *raiyats* In demanding revenue from the *raiyats* you should not be harsh, and should not cause pain to the retainers and soldiers by unreasonable demands You should make every endeavour for the amelioration of the condition of *darwīshes*, and for keeping their hearts in peace and comfort You should (in fact) so act that when the elemental body, and the limbs, which constitute it, come to extinction, and the physical form and the bodily arrangements pass away, the pages of the volumes of time remain full of descriptions of your good deeds, and praises of your acts

Couplet

He who after death leaves a name behind,
Be sure that in life he did great deeds

Further you should beware (of causing) the lamentations of the oppressed, who have suffered at the hands of tyrants, and of the injured who have suffered privation and hardship, and you should know for a certainty that the¹ real favour of the great and holy God always watches over the condition of the oppressed ones "

When the *amīrs* and *vazīrs* received information of these directions, ² Malīk Nizām-ul-mulk, who was entrusted with the administra-

¹ The meaning of the words عى عناد, which in one MS are written as عى عى, is not clear in the context

² This is also mentioned by Firishtah, who explains the matter somewhat better than Nizām-ud-dīn He says, that as contrary to their representation, Sultān 'Alā ud-dīn made Humāyūn Shāh Zālim (tyrant), whose manners were hateful to the people, his heir, Nizām-ul-mulk Daulatābādī, who had just

tion of the kingdom fled and went to his son who had the title of *Malik ut tujjar* and was the governor of Junir and from there both of them went away together to Cujrit. When on the 21st of Jamādī ul āwwal 862 A H Sultan Ala ud dīn took his place from the throne (*ta^lht*) on the plank (*ta^lhta*) of the coffin. Saif Khan Māllu Khan and other *amirs* rendered homage to Hasan Khan Shahzada who was the younger brother of Humayun Khan and placed him on the throne the common people plundered the palace of Humayūn Khan and set fire to it. Humayun Khan determined on flight³ with 80 horsemen. It so happened that on the way elephant drivers (*filbanan*) and officers of the bed chamber and of the private apartment (*pardadaran*) and other retainers (*sayer ahl i hashm*) saw him and hastened to join his service. Hasan Khan sitting on the throne saw Humayun Khan enter the palace and fear overwhelmed him and he could not sit firmly on that great place and

before that been made the *ta^lil us saltanat* and who was well known for his intelligence and knowledge of affairs fled before Ala ud dīn's death and went to his son who after the death of Qasim Beg Saf shukan had received the title of *Malik ut tujjar* and was the Subahdar of Daulatabad and Junir and from there before even the news of the death of Sultan Ala ud dīn had arrived they went away to Gujrat.

The above is a translation from the lith ed of *Firishtah* but Col Briggs does not mention Nizām ul mulk or his son by name but says. Several of the nobles made their escape to Guzerat before the king's death to avoid the tyranny of his successor.

¹ *Firishtah* does not give the date of Sultan Ala ud dīn's death but the year is 860 A H as in the text. Mr Sewell (page 98) says Ala ud dīn died February 13th A D 1458 (?). He says in a note *Firishtah* says that he reigned 23 years 9 months and 20 days which gives this date. The Burhan i Ma asir fixes his decease at the end of Jamādī ul āwwal 860 A H which answers to April 1458 A D. As will be seen a little further down according to Nizām ud dīn Sultan Ala ud dīn reigned for 23 years and 9 months and 2 days longer than the period mentioned by *Firishtah*.

Firishtah's account agrees but he says that the *amirs* kept the fact of the death of Sultan Ala ud dīn concealed and Sh h Habib ul lah son of Khal l ul lah (who had come from Kirman in Persia on the invitation of Sultān Ahmad Shāh—See note 1 page 50) and others also joined them.

³ The words are عرب هرب نمود *Firishtah* however says با عازب گران. *ع* gave battle to the plunderers and the plunderers being defeated took shelter with Hasan Khan. Humayūn pursued them and entered the palace.

came down from it. ¹The *amīns* and *vazīrs* and all the others then kissed the ground of service, and (Humāyūn Khān) sat on the throne. The first order that he gave was ²this, that they should tie Saif Khān to the foot of an elephant, and drag him through the whole city. Mallū Khān, seeing this (barbarous) punishment fled, and took shelter in a corner.

The period of his (i.e., Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn's) reign was twenty-three years, nine months and twenty-two days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN HUMĀYŪN SHĀH SON OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN

The *amīns* and *malīks* with great unwillingness and reluctance placed their heads of loyalty and their foreheads of fealty on the ground of service. Sultān Humāyūn Shāh although he was well known for great bravery and manliness, and distinguished for eloquence of speech and sweetness of tongue, and bravery, and courage, yet was harsh and malevolent in his temper. He showed great excess in committing sins, and great deficiency in the payment of just dues. He was sound in wisdom and policy, but barbarous and cruel in the punishment of criminals and offenders. Although he was ferocious and wrathful, the sanity of his judgment was such, that every project that he sketched out on the board of his mind, with the pen of thought, resulted according to his anticipation. When he took his place on the throne of empire, he devoted all his energy to the appointment of a perfect and wise *vazīr*, and he laid down, that the ascent up the gradations of rule and the steps of empire is not possible, except with the help and assistance of a *vazīr*, of whose world-adorning wisdom, the structure of the empire and the amelioration of the condition of the *rāyyats* would be the result, and the increase of the revenue and the administration of the army would be the fruits

¹ The reading is the same in the MSS and in the lith ed, but the sentence appears to me to be incomplete, as it does not say before whom the *amīns* kissed the ground, and who sat on the throne.

² According to Firishtah he ordered that Shāh Habīb-ullah and others should be cast into prison. Mallū Khān fought his way to the frontier of the Carnātic. Col Briggs says that Hasan Khān's eyes were put out, but I cannot find this in the lith ed of Firishtah.

of whose mature deliberations He entrusted the duties of the *ta'ir* to ¹ *Kh̲waja* *Najm ud din Qiran Gilanī* who was a wise and under standing man experienced and God fearing and the reins of binding and loosening and the tying and untying of all matters of the govern ment of the country were placed in the grasp of his power and the title of *Malik ut tujjar* was conferred on him

And in the spring time of his (i.e. *Humayūn Kh̲an*'s) rule *Sikandar Kh̲an Bukhari* who had formerly rebelled against Sultan *Ala ud din* and had joined Sultan *Mahmūd Kh̲alji* became ashamed and repentant and forgetting the duties of allegiance made the field of the government of *Humayun Shah* dark with the dust of disturb ance and having raised the standard of rebellion went away to ² *Mall onda* with a large force *Humayun Shah* determined to march to *Malkonda* and sent ⁴ *Kh̲an Jahan* two stages in advance of him self *Sikandar Kh̲an* saw that *Kh̲an Jahan* was weak and attacked him with force and violence and defeated him ⁵ On the following

¹ This is the name in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is *حواحه نعم الدین* *Sanjam ud din* *Firishtah* however says that in accordance with the late Sultān's direc tion Sultan *Humayūn* made *Kh̲waja Mahmud Gawān* the *Malik ut tujjar* and the *Valilush shāhi* and the *tarafdar* of *Bijapur* *M. Hidayat Hosain* has *محمد* after *فان* in the text

² *Nizām ud din* does not explain the reason of *Sikandar Kh̲an*'s new rebel lion. It appears from *Firishtah* that *Sikandar Kh̲an* who was a companion of Sultan *Humayūn* when the latter was yet *shah uda* fully expected to be made a *pah salar* of *Tilang* but when he found that *Malik Shah* who was a descen dant of one of the great men among the *Mughals* and according to some a des cendant of the Sultans of the family of *Chengiz*, *Kh̲an* was made *Kh̲waja Jahān* and *tarafdar* of *Tilang* and a nephew of *Imād ul mull Churi* was made a com mander of a thousand horse and received *jagirs* in *Tilang* he was disappoint ed and left the court without asking for permission and went to his father at *Nalkanda* and the latter had no alternative but to collect men to support his son

³ The name is *Malkonda* or *Balkonda* in the MSS. and the lith. ed. *Firishtah* calls it *نالكندا* *Nalkanda* and *Col Briggs* has *Nowlgoonda*

⁴ According to *Firishtah* he was the governor of *Berar* and had come to offer congratulations to the Sultan on his accession

⁵ The account of the expedition and the battle as given by *Firishtah* is different from and more elaborate than that given by *Nizām ud din*. According to him *Sikandar Kh̲an* met *Kh̲an Jahān* and defeated him. Then *Humayūn*

day, when the standards of the dawn rose over the eastern horizon, Humāyūn Shāh arrayed his army, and advanced to the field of battle and slaughter. After the two armies had met, and the flame of battle had flared up, the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standards of Humāyūn Shāh and the enemy fled into the desert of dishonour and a number of them were crushed under the feet of the elephant of death. Sikandar Khān also fell down from the seat of his saddle on the bed of the ground. Jalāl Khān Bukhārī fled from the battle-field and shut himself up in the fort of Mālkonda. When the Sultān arrived in the neighbourhood of that place, he obtained a safe conduct, and carried his life away to safety from the danger-zone of the (Sultān's) wrath. The Sultān returned to his capital.

In the year 863 A H, when the tyranny of Humāyūn Shāh became patent to all, the Rāys of Tilang placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance, and shortened their arms in the payment of the stipulated tribute. Humāyūn Shāh conferred the title of

Shāh marched in person and encamped in front of Nalkonda. He waited for Jalāl Khān and Sikandar Khān to come and render him homage, when Sikandar Khān made a night attack on the Sultān's camp and did some damage. The next morning the Sultān advanced to seize the fort, but Sikandar Khān advanced with seven thousand or eight thousand horsemen and met him. Humāyūn Shāh sent him a message, that it would not be right for him to fight with his benefactor, and offered him any *parwana* he might choose in Daulatābād as his *jāgīr*, if he would only make his submission. Sikandar Khān replied that if Humāyūn Shāh was Ahmad Shāh's son's son, he was his daughter's son, if the Sultān would give him the country of Tilang well and good, otherwise he should be ready for battle. Then Humāyūn Shāh became angry, and prepared for battle, and Sikandar Khān did the same. Sikandar Khān fought bravely, and the battle continued all day, when Malik-ut-tujjār Gāwān and Khwāja Jahān Turk attacked Sikandar Khān from the right and left wing, and Humāyūn Shāh attacked him in the centre. Sikandar Khān like an infuriated tiger attacked Humāyūn Shāh, and routed his companions. As the elephant on which Humāyūn Shāh was riding was killing many warriors Sikandar Khān attacked it with his spear, when the elephant caught him by the trunk and threw him on the ground, and his own followers who were riding close behind him trampled on him and killed him. Humāyūn Shāh then sent men in pursuit of the routed enemy. Nalkonda was then besieged, and Jalāl Khān surrendered it with much treasure. His life was spared, but he was kept in imprisonment.

¹ Khawaja Jahan on Malik Shah a Turki slave and sent him to the country of Tilang and Nizām ul mulk Ghūrī was sent with him and the Sultan himself followed with twenty thousand horsemen and forty elephants. Khawaja Jahan besieged the fort of Deorlonda. The garrison prayed for help from the Ray of Orissa agreeing to pay him a large sum of money for it. The Ray sent a grand army with one hundred elephants. Nizām ul mulk Ghūrī said: We should go away from the foot of the fort and station ourselves in the open field before the Ray of Orissa arrives. Khawaja Jahan who had no experience considered the opinion of Nizām ul mulk unreasonable and remained where he was. The next day when the light giving sun rose over the eastern horizon the Ray of Orissa and the garrison attacked Khawaja Jahan from the two sides and he was defeated. He fled eighty *karohs* and joined Humāyun Shah. He represented to the latter that the defeat was due to Nizām ul mulk.

¹ As we have seen Khawaja Jahan had already been employed in the war against Sikandar Khan. Firishtah's description of him has already been given in note " page 77. Firishtah says that Humāyūn Shah attacked Deorlonda because the Talangi amindars who held it had been on friendly terms with Sikandar Khan. He sent the two officers named to attack it and himself went to Warangal (Warangal however appears to be a long way beyond Deorkonda). The garrison made several sallies but were defeated each time and when they were in considerable distress they prayed for help from the Ray of Orissa. He sent a large body of men and also some elephants of war and sent an announcement of his own approach. Then Nizām ul mulk Ghūrī and Khawaja Jahan had a conference. Nizām ul mulk gave the advice which is mentioned in the text. Khawaja Jahan said that if they moved away the Talngas would pursue them and they should therefore prepare for battle where they were. Nizām ul mulk Ghūrī had to remain silent. Then the battle took place and both Nizām ul mulk Ghūrī and Khan Jahan fled to Humāyūn Shāh at Warangal. Khan Jahan falsely ascribed the defeat to Nizām ul mulk and Humāyun Shah without any inquiry ordered him to be put to death and his relations and adherents went and joined Sultan Mahmūd Khalji. Khan Jahan was imprisoned in a fort. Humāyun Shāh was intending to send another army to Deorkonda when news came from Ahmadabad that Yusuf Turk had taken Hasan Khan and Shah Habib ul lah towards the city of Bir.

There is a curious resemblance between the language of Firishtah in some of the above sentences to that of Nizām ud din and it appears to me that he copied from the latter though of course in other places his accounts are more logical and accurate.

action, and Humāyūn Shāh's disposition turned against Nizām-ul-mulk, and he spoke unbecoming words to the latter who fled and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī. Humāyūn Shāh also cast Khwāja Jahān from favour, and made him over to a jailor. And according to another statement, Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī was put to death with great contumely, and his associates and tribesmen went and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī.

In the year 864 A.H., Humāyūn Shāh again determined on the conquest of Tilang. On the way seven of the special associates of Amīrzāda ¹Muhibb-ud-dīn Habīb-ul-lah, who on account of some

¹ There appears to be some confusion in the names. We know Shāh Habīb ul-lah and Shāh Muhibb-ul-lah, but not Amīrzāda Muhibb-ud-dīn Firishtah. In the corresponding passage has Shāh Habīb-ul-lah. There is not much difference between Nizām-ud-dīn's account and that of Firishtah, as to the way in which the release of Shāh Habīb-ul-lah and Shāhzāda Hasan Khān was effected. But the seven adherents of Shāh Habīb ul-lah, who are called his مختصان, intimate friends, in the *Tabaqāt* are called specifically his مريدان or disciples. Malik Yūsuf Turk is called Yūsuf Turk Kachāl. Then again the دربار citadel, in which the prison was located, is called the دربار by Firishtah, and the seraglio by Col Briggs. It appears also from Firishtah's account, that the original intention of the conspirators was to effect the release of Shāh Habīb ul-lah alone, and they released Hasan Khān and Yehayā Khān and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, because they begged them to do so. Firishtah also says (contrary to Nizām ud-dīn's account) that it was after these men had been released, that the seven thousand other prisoners were set free.

There is, up to this again, a curious similarity between the languages of Nizām-ud dīn, and Firishtah, and the latter, as the later author, appears to me to have copied from the former.

The subsequent movements of Hasan Khān and Shāh Habīb-ul-lah, some of which are not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn, are thus described by Firishtah. After leaving the city, they remained for six or seven days in the garden of Kamthānā, which was three *karōhs* from Ahmadābād Bidar. Then with three thousand horsemen and five thousand foot soldiers they attempted to seize the citadel of Ahmadābād Bidar, but finding this to be difficult they went towards the town of Bīr, and took possession of the country around. Yūsuf Turk was made *Amīr ul-umrā* and Shāh Habīb-ul-lah *vazīr*, and they commenced to collect troops.

Humāyūn Shāh now returned to Ahmadābād Bidar, and he put the three thousand soldiers, whom he had left to guard the city, to death with much torture, and he put the *lotwāl* in an iron cage and had one of his limbs cut off

heavenly catastrophe had become dispersed like the constellation of the Bear again became united like the Pleiades and as in the time of prosperity they had been partakers of his wealth they spoke among themselves that as that moon of the sky of bravery was in eclipse what use was there in life It was right that they should think out a plan for his release They went to Malik Yusuf Turk who among the slaves of Sultān Ala ud din was well known for his honesty and piety and famous for his good deeds and his devotion to God and the cup of whose hopes had always been filled with the wine of the benefaction of the *Amirzada* and lifted the veil from the face of their plan That worthy man joined with them and made some of the guards his confederates and having waited for a proper opportunity went with twelve horsemen and fifty foot soldiers to the gate of the citadel When the time of the afternoon prayer passed he dismounted from his horse and after performing the prescribed devotions prayed to the great and holy God for success and help About the time of sunset they went close to the gate Most of the guards had gone away on their various businesses and the few who remained stretched out their hands to forbid and stop them Malik Yusuf Turk acted with courtesy and gentleness and showed them a *farman* with a red seal as is the custom with all *farmans* in the Dakin which he had prepared beforehand and had taken with him and so they passed through the first gate When they arrived at the second (i.e. the inner) gate the guards met them with hostility and resistance and although the forged *farman* was shown to them

every day He was compelled to eat it and he was taken round the city till he died After that Humayun Shah sent eight thousand horsemen and an enormous number of infantry against his brother Hasan Khan A battle took place outside the town of Bir in which through the exertions of Shah Habib ul lah Hasan Khan was victorious Then Humayun Shah sent more troops His natural ferocity now blazed up and he sent the army which had accompanied him to Tilang to Bir keeping the wives and children of the officers as hostage so that they might not join Hasan Khan Another battle was fought and Hasan Khan was defeated and he went away with six or seven hundred soldiers to Bijapur There Siraj Khan Junaid treacherously seized them Shah Habib ul lah suffered martyrdom while resisting his capture but Prince Haan Khan and the others were sent prisoners to Ahmadabad Bidar

they did not accept it, and said that there should be a *parwāna* (an order or permit) from the *kotwāl*. Malik Yūsuf immediately cut off the head of the chief guard with his sword, and entered the citadel. There was great tumult, and in the first instance they went to the big prison and broke down the gate. About seven thousand prisoners including Saiyids and learned and wise men and men of the middle class who were confined in that prison considered it a great boon, and each one went to his own nook and corner.

They then went from that place, and releasing *Amīrzāda* Habīb-ul-lah, and the sons of the Sultāns, and Jalāl *Khān* Bukhārī, each one went away in a separate direction. The *kotwāl* (Police Superintendent) of the city seized Jalāl *Khān* Bukhārī, who was eighty years of age, and Yahya *Khān*, a son of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn, and put them to death with great torment and torture. Hasan *Khān* and *Amīrzāda* Habīb-ul-lah went to the house of a barber, who had been in the service of the latter, and had their heads shaved off, in the manner of *qalandars* (*faqīrs*, mendicants). The *Amīrzāda* wished to retire into an obscure corner and cover his feet under the skirts of contentment, but as Hasan *Khān* said that the people of the city and the soldiers were on his side, on account of the tyranny and injustice of Humāyūn Shāh, and it was certain that when the falcon of his greatness should spread the wings of fortune he would be able to seize Humāyūn Shāh like a bird whose wings should have been cut, and a wild animal whose legs should have been broken, without trouble and difficulty. As the *Amīrzāda* always fashioned (lit. sewed) a *kulāh* (high cap) of this felt (*i.e.*, had such an ambition himself), he cancelled his original intention, and making strong terms of engagement with Hasan *Khān*, they both went out of the city. Soldiers came to them in large numbers. Humāyūn Shāh on hearing this put his sword into friend and stranger. When he arrived in the city of Bīdar, he perpetrated such acts of cruelty, that ¹Hajjāj became (in comparison with him) Naushirwān, the just. His body has perished, but his bad name and the memory of his tyranny have continued in the world. One of his victims made this quatrain about it

¹ A cruel tyrant of Arabia

¹ Quatrain

Ah tyrant ! fear the sighs of the heart of sleepless men
 And fear thy bad deeds and thy evil inciting spirit
 Look at the eyelashes steeped in blood of thy victim !
 Fear that dagger sharp that drips with blood !

When the news of the return of Humayun Shah reached *Shahzada* Hasan Khan and *Amirada* Habib ul lah they found themselves to be without the power of withstanding him and turned their faces towards Bijapur. Siraj Khan who afterwards received the title of Mu'izzam Khan behaved towards them with courtesy and flattery and presented much tribute and after taking oaths took them into the citadel. He then collected a force in the course of the night and attacked them. The common people became dispersed. Hasan Khan and Mir Habib ul lah and the seven friends who had brought them out of prison were besieged in a kiosk in which they had been accommodated. Hasan Khan after receiving a safe conduct went to the besiegers but *Amirada* Habib ul lah in agreement with his friends said 'We are all prepared for death and the birds of our spirit will not lower their heads into the nest of your safe conduct. They fought and exerted themselves to the extent of their means and their strength and reached the end and object of their hope (i.e. they heroically met their death).

² Humayun Shah when he saw Hasan Khan throw him in his

¹ This quatrain is quoted with some variations by Firishtah also. He says that it was written by the poet Maulana Naziri who had according to him got the title of Malik ush shah or the King of poets apparently in imitation of the Malik ut tujr. In the version printed in the lith ed. of Firishtah the second line is *و از نفس بد سوم سر انگشتر برس* and the third line is *مرگان دم الرد*. I think the third line as quoted by Nizām ud din is better *مظلومان بن*.

But see note 1 page 80 from which it will appear that according to Firishtah they fought two battles with Humayun Shāh's army near Bir and were victorious in the first. Nizām ud dīn omits all mention of what happened near Bir.

² Firishtah mentions the atrocities which were perpetrated by Humayun Shāh on the companions of Hasan Khān who were sent to Ahmadābad Bidar by Siraj Khān. It appears from Firishtah that Shāh Habib ul lah alone attained to martyrdom and the others including Yusuf Turk and down to

own presence before a tiger ¹ Sayyid Tāhūr, the poet has said the following chronogram on the date of the death of *Amīr-zāda* Habīb-ul-lah

Quatrain

In the month of Sha'bān in India, to martyrdom attained,
Habīb-ul-lah Ghāzī, may his tomb be sanctified !

The mind of Tāhūr, sought the date of his death

He found it in *rūh-i-pāk-i-Na'mat-ul-lah* !

(the holy spirit of Na'mat-ul-lah)

Sayyid Na'mat-ul-lah was Shāh Habīb-ul-lah's great ancestor. They say that Sūrāj Khān was afflicted with leprosy in the course of a short time.

Then, in short, in the year 865 A.H., when the tyranny of Humāyūn Shāh reached to such a pitch, that he stretched out his hands to wives and children of other men, and he became the slave of his lust. Sometimes he ordered that a bride should be seized on the road, and should be brought into his seraglio, and he after satisfying his lust, sent the woman to the house of her husband, and sometimes he put the members of the harem to death without any cause. The *amīrs* became suspicious of him to such a degree, that whenever they went to make their *salāms* (homage) to him, they first of all gave directions to their sons, before placing their feet on the road.

(At last) ² Shihāb Khān who was the guardian of the seraglio

even the menials such as *farāshes*, water carriers and sweepers were sent to Ahmadābād Bidar, where they were put to death with cruel tortures, and their wives and children, and others in any way connected with Hasan Khān were also put to death with unheard-of and unnameable cruelties.

¹ Firishtah calls him Sayyid Tāhūr Astarābādī, and he also quotes the chronograms.

² Firishtah has two versions of the circumstances of Humāyūn Shāh's death. One is that he became ill, and that when he had no hope of his surviving the illness, he made his eldest son, Nizām Khān, his heir, and he released Khwājah Jahān Turk from prison, and sent for the Malik ut tujjār from Tilang, and appointed the former to be *vakīl ush-shāhī*, and the latter to be the *vazīr*, and he directed his son always to act under the guidance of his mother. The other version is somewhat like that given by Nizām ud-dīn, but it is said that Humāyūn Shāh had been ill, and was murdered after his recovery. The guardian of the harem is called Shihāb Khān eunuch in the 11th ed. of Firishtah.

associated some *Habshis* with him and on the night of the ¹27th *Dhīqa dah* of the aforementioned year one of the female *Habshi* slaves struck Humayun Shah when he was resting in the seraglio on the head with a piece of wood and made him like those who had been dead a thousand years ago

Couplet

In this turquoise palace with calamities filled
For evil evil ever is the recompense sure

The poet Naziri who was the friend and companion of *Amir-ada* Habib ul lah and who had been delivered from captivity by the kind exertions of Mahil Yusuf Turk wrote this verse on the date of the death of Humayun Shah

Verses

Humāyūn Shah is dead the day has pleasant become
God is great oh happy and auspicious death!
The earth is full of flavour new The date of the death
Bring out e en from *Dhaug i jahan*

The word *Dhaug i jahan* (flavour of the world) becomes the date of his death

The period of his reign was ³ three years and six months and five days

It is also said that Humayun Shah was killed when he was sleeping after drinking some intoxicating liquor Col Briggs gives the second version somewhat briefly and does not give the name of the eunuch

¹ Firistah has 28th *Dhīqa dah* 86 Col Briggs gives September 3rd 1461 as the corresponding date of the Christian era Mr Sewell also gives the 28th *Dhīqa dah* of course from Firistah but he has the 27th September 1461 as the corresponding English date

² This verse has also been quoted by Firistah who however substitutes *و دسب عالم* the world has been saved for *و دور حوس سد* at the end of the first line and *نارنج مرگس* for *نارنج فوس*

³ Firistah has three years six months and six days as according to him the death took place on the 8th and not on the 27th *Dhīqa dah* See note 1 above

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF NIZĀM SHĀH, SON OF
HUMĀYŪN SHĀH

When Nizām Shāh in his eighth year sat in his father's place, the establishment of the rules of government and the strengthening of the acts of administration were entrusted in the hands of ¹ *Makh̄dūma-i-Jahān* and that veiled one behind the curtain of chastity directed all her energies in furnishing the bed of equity and justice, and shortened the hand of the tyrant from the skirt of his victim. But as owing to the great oppression of Humāyūn Shāh, the hearts of men were wounded and lacerated, the work of government could not be regulated and organized.

At this time the ³ Rāy of Orissa having received information of

¹ The widow of Humāyūn Shāh and the mother of Nizām Shāh, whom Firishtah describes as a *عالمه* or a wise woman.

² Firishtah describes how, every morning, the two ministers *Khawājah Jahān* and *Malik ut tujjār Gāwān* went to the palace and through the intervention of a woman of the name of *Māh Bānū*, they had a conference with the queen-mother, and then they took the young Sultān and placed him on the turquoise throne, and carried out the administration on the lines which had been determined upon in consultation with the queen-mother.

³ Firishtah says, the Rāy of the *اوريسه و اوريا* in concert with *zamīndārs* of Tilang came to conquer the country of the Dakin, by way of Rājahmandri, and they laid waste all the country as far as Kulās. I cannot say exactly what the word after *اوريسه*, which looks like *اوريا* *Auriyā* or *Uriyā* is, and whether the Rāy of Orissa and *Auriyā* represent one Rāy or two Rāys. Firishtah has the two words all through his account, but Col. Briggs does not mention *Auriyā*. Firishtah's account agrees with Nizām-ud dīn's as to the main incident, namely the attack of Shāh Muhibb ul-lah on the vanguard of the Orissa army. But before coming to that he says that, Nizām Shāh's advisers proceeded with great calmness to collect troops, and they got together forty thousand horsemen and marched to the camp of the Rāy of Orissa and *Auriyā*, taking the young Sultān with them. The Rāy intended to take possession of the territories and then after extorting tribute to return to his own kingdom. But Nizām Shāh's ministers sent word to him that they intended to invade and conquer Jājnagar and Orissa and *Auriyā*, but that as he had now invaded the Dakin, matters had become easy for them, and unless he paid tribute, and restored whatever his men had seized, not one of the latter would be allowed to return in safety. Immediately after this Shāh Muhibb ul-lah, who had come to carry on a *jehāp* (religious war), fell on the vanguard of the Orissa army. The action is

the state of things came forward with a large body of cavalry and infantry to plunder and ravage Bidar and by successive marches came within thirty *korohs* of the city. The *amirs* in spite of the fact that they were unprepared marched out for the campaign taking the eight year old Nizam Shah with them. When the distance (between the two) was only eight *korohs* Amir ada Muhibb ul lah with only one hundred and sixty brave and well armed men separated himself from the army of Nizam Shah and advancing forward fell upon the vanguard of the Ray of Orissa which consisted of ten thou and infantry and four hundred horsemen. From morning till the time of midday they fought with courage and bravery till in the end the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the standard of the Chazis and the vanguard of the Orissa army fled and joined the main army. The Ray of Orissa marched away at night and returned to his dominion. The *amirs* carried out the customary thanksgiving to God and returned at the stirrups of Nizam Shah.

They had not yet settled down at Bidar when Sultan Mahmūd Khalji at the instigation of Nizam ul mulk Churi invaded the

described by Firishtah in almost the same words as Nizam ul din but Firishtah goes on to say that the Dakin army pursued the Orissa army which lost two or three thou and men daily. So the Ray took shelter in a fort and sent me sages expressive of his distress and finally agreed to pay five lakhs of silver *tanhas*. Col Briggs says in his translation that the threatening me sage was sent with Shāh Muhibb ul lah but his escort being stopped by the infidels he charged the Ray's advanced picquets so boldly that supposing the whole army was in motion the Hindoos fell back on their main body. I cannot find anything in the lithed of Firishtah which agrees with this. There is nothing in it about the message being taken by Shāh Muhibb ul lah. In fact it appears that Shāh Muhibb ul lah only joined the army to carry on a *jehūd* or religious war. Col Briggs also says in a note that Firishtah hastily adopted the language of Moolla Dawood of Bidar and other historians of the Bahmuny dynasty and has not exercised any discretion or even much research in not endeavouring to account for the sudden retreat of the Hindoos. I do not quite agree with Col Briggs. There were many instances of such panic and sudden retreat in the case of the Rays of Bijānagar and others.

¹ This is mentioned by Firishtah but not by Col Briggs. Firishtah also says that Sultan Mahmud advanced with twenty eight thousand horsemen and the Ray of Orissa and Auriy and the Rays of Talangāna advanced at the same time. Nizam Shah's ministers sent the Talangāna army against the Ray of

Deccan, and began to advance by successive marches. The *amīrs*, taking Nizām Shāh with them, advanced to meet the army of Mandū. When there was a distance of three *farsulhs* (between the two armies) Nizām Shāh nominated ten thousand horsemen to the right wing and placed them in charge of Khwājah Mahmūd Gilānī, who had the title of Malik-ut-tujjār. The left wing was made over to Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, and he himself took up his stand in the centre with eleven thousand horsemen and one hundred elephants. The superintendence of the centre of the army was made over to Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī divided his twenty-eight thousand horsemen into three detachments and advanced to the field of battle and bloodshed. After the two armies had met, Malik-ut-tujjār advancing rapidly fell upon the left wing of the Khaljī army. Mahābat Khān, the governor of Chandēri, and Zahir-ul-mulk the *vazīr*, who commanded the left wing of that army were killed on the battle-field and a great defeat fell on the army of Mandū, so that Malik-ut-tujjār pursued it for two *lorōhs*, and plundered the Khaljī camp.

Orissa and Auriyā and the Rāys of Talingāna, and themselves advanced with the armies of Bijāpūr, Daulatābād and Berār, at the stirrups of Nizām Shāh against Sultān Mahmūd. The two armies met at the neighbourhood of the fort of Qandahār. Firishtah mentions the attack by the Malik ut tujjār, whom however, he calls Mahmūd Gāwān, on the left wing of the Mandū army and says that although Mahābat Khān and Zahir-ul-mulk fought bravely, they were at last compelled to retire and were killed. He also mentions the attack of the left wing of the Dakinī army under Nizām ul mulk Turk, on the right wing of the Mandū army which was led by Shāhzāda Ghivās-ud-dīn. This is not mentioned by Nizām ud-dīn. They fought bravely, but the *Shāhzāla* was wounded and was thrown from his horse, and was about to be killed when he was rescued. This wing of the Mandū army was thus defeated and was pursued by the Dakinī army, and the camp was looted, and fifty elephants were seized. Sultān Mahmūd seeing both wings of his army routed determined on retiring to Mandū but one of the *amīns* dissuaded him. At this time Nizām Shāh wanted bravely to attack the centre of the Mālwa army. Khwājah Jahān stopped him, but after a time he advanced with ten thousand horsemen to attack the centre of Sultān Mahmūd's army, which consisted of twelve thousand horsemen. At this time Sultān Mahmūd hit the forehead of an elephant, which Sikandar Khān a Turkī slave of Khwājah Jahān was riding. The elephant became furious, and trampled on many men belonging to the Dakinī army, and it was likely

At this time when the men were engaged in plundering Sultān Mahmūd appeared before Nizām Shāh's army with twelve thousand horsemen Khwajāh Jahān Turk who was the leader of the centre of the army turned round and seizing the bridle of the Sultān's horse turned towards Bidar and in spite of the fact that Malik ut tujjar had been victorious over the Malwa army the army of Nizām Shāh was defeated and the men who were engaged in plundering were slain at the spot where they were Malkah Jahān being apprised of the treachery and deceit of Khwajāh Jahān entrusted the defence of the fort of Bidar to Mallu Khān and took Nizām Shāh with her to Iruzabad Sultān Mahmūd pursued the army of the Deccan as

that Nizām Shāh himself should receive some injury Then Sikandar Khān either through foolishness or through some enmity which he had against Khwajāh Jahān did not exhort the army to fight but carried away Nizām Shāh whether he liked it or not placing him behind himself on the same elephant and they stood a short distance behind the army The *amirs* not seeing the standard of the Sultān in its place turned round one after another and taking Nizām Shāh who was standing in a corner with them went back to the capital

The above is Firishtah's version of the engagement in the lithed It will be seen that the account of the latter part of the battle and of the way in which Nizām Shāh was taken away from the field differs materially from that given by Nizām ud dīn

¹ According to Firishtah there was no doubt at least at that time about the good faith or behaviour of Khwajāh Jahān The only question was about the conduct of Sikandar Khān Firishtah says that the queen mother at first praised him for having brought her son out of danger but when he went to see Khwajāh Jahān the latter ordered him to be imprisoned for having brought Nizām Shāh away at such an inopportune moment The other Turki slaves however went to the queen mother and defended the conduct of Sikandar Khān She sympathised with them but expressed her inability to do anything just then Khwajāh Jahān hearing of this sent Sikandar Khān to her and he was ordered to be set at liberty

Firishtah however goes on to say that the queen mother had suspicions of the treachery and deceit of Khwajāh Jahān and knew the defeat was due to his want of firmness and courage and therefore with the advice of Malik ut tujjar Mahmūd Gawan (or Gilani) she placed the defence of the citadel of Ahmadabād Bidar in charge of Mallu Khān Firishtah goes on to say that Sultān Mahmūd of Malwa took the fort of Bidar after a siege of seventeen days and took possession of the greater part of Berar and Daulatābād so that people thought that the power of the Bahmanis should pass to the Khaljis when the news of the approach of the Gujrat army came

far as the gate of Bīdar, and having devastated the country outside the fort, occupied himself with providing the necessary apparatus for its capture

Nizām Shāh had, at the time of starting on the campaign, written a letter in the language of sincerity, giving an account of what was happening to Sultān Mahmūd of Gujrāt. Now when he was ¹recovering at Firūzābād and the men who had fled had assembled again, he sent Khwājah Jahān with a large army to fight with Sultān Mahmūd (Khaljī). About this time information came that Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī had arrived at the frontiers of the Deccan, with eighty thousand horsemen. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, finding that he had not the strength to withstand him, started on the seventeenth day for Mandū, by way of ² Gōndwāra. Khwājah Jahān

¹ The actual words are در فیروز آباد نفس درست کرد Firishtah whose language at this part of the narrative resembles that of Nizām-ud-dīn has نفس راست کرد

² The name is گوندواره in one MS, گوندوانه in the other, and گوندوانه, in the lith ed. Firishtah has گوندواره, but Col Briggs has Gondwana. Firishtah's account agrees with Nizām ud-dīn's, almost *verbatim*, up to the mention of the arrival of Sultān Mahmūd of Gujrāt. After that he goes on to say that Makhdūma 1-Jahān sent Malik-ut-tujjār Mahmūd Gāwān with five or six thousand horsemen by way of Bīr, to meet the Sultān of Gujrāt. The latter sent twenty thousand horsemen, with many of his great *amīns* to co operate with Malik-ut-tujjār. More soldiers joined him, and then Malik-ut-tujjār advanced with forty thousand Dakinī and Gujrātī horsemen towards Ahmadābād Bīdar, Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī who was engaged in the siege of the citadel, and was fighting daily with Mallū Khān, now started for Mandū in great distress. Malik-ut-tujjār sent ten thousand horsemen to Berāi to stop the road and himself with ten thousand Dakinī, and twenty thousand Gujrātī horsemen, advanced to a point between Qandahār and Bīr, where the encampment of the Mālwa army was located, and prevented the importation of grain and other provisions into the camp. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had thirty thousand horsemen ready for battle, but Malik-ut-tujjār did not meet him, and went on carrying out his own plans, till there were signs of a famine in the Mālwa camp. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī then blinded (کور کرده), Col Briggs has killed) the elephants he had with him, and set fire to all his heavy baggage. He then started well armed and in light marching order having washed his hands of his life (i.e., almost despairing of arriving safely at Mandū). He told the head-man of Gōndwāra, who has with him, to take him along a good road. The

returned after pursuing him for three or four stages. At the time of his return as the road through Condwara was uneven the Gonds harassed him at every stage and some thousand of men and animals perished on account of scarcity of water. It is stated that at the first stage (of the journey) about six thousand men died for want of water and the price of one *lāsa* (cup) of water was cheap at two *tanlas*. In truth as the act of Sultan Mahmud Khalji was in reality outside of rectitude and justice the result of such unrighteous conduct could not be anything but misfortune and wretchedness.

Couplet

Plant such a branch that it bear fortunate fruit
Sow such seed that a harvest thou mayst reap

When he got out of the desert he ordered the ¹ Rajas of Cōndwara who had performed meritorious services and were innocent to be put to death.

In the year 867 A.H. Sultan Mahmud Khalji again advanced with ninety thousand horsemen to attempt the conquest of the

headman who wanted to have his revenge (it does not appear for what injury) said that there was no broad road in that part of the country along which the army might march but there was a road along a waterless desert. The Sultan said it was better to escape along that road than to be killed by the Dakinis and marched forward. They suffered great privation from heat and scarcity of water and also from robbers and thieves. When they at last got out of the desert the Sultan knowing that the crowd of robbers and the concealment of wells had all been brought about at the instigation of the headman ordered him to be put to death. The Gond said he had had his revenge and he was not afraid of death because he had sons living and he expected to be born again from which Firishtah infers that the Gonds like other Hindu *kafirs* believed in the transmigration of souls.

¹ But see the later part of the preceding note for Firishtah's version of the behaviour of the Gond chief or headman.

Firishtah's account of this second invasion does not differ materially from that in the text. In fact Firishtah says that he was indebted for an account of this invasion to Nizam ud din Ahmad but he apparently adds one or two touches of his own for instance he says that on arrival in the neighbourhood of Daulatabad Sultan Mahmud made some display of his grandeur (کروڑی نمود) that Sultan Mahmud Gujrati sent a well equipped army without delay or hesitation towards Sultanpur and also that the two Sultans i.e. those of Gujrat and the Dakin who were bright as the sun and beautiful as Joseph bade adieu to

Deccan Nizām Shāh also advanced after making preparations for war, and asked for help from Sultān Mahmūd of Gujrāt. When Sultān Mahmūd K̲haljī arrived on the frontier of Daulatābād his scouts brought the news, that Sultān Mahmūd of Gujrāt was approaching. The army of Mandū then left the road (to Bidar), and marched away towards Mālkonda, and returned to Mandū by way of Gōndwāra. ¹ Nizām Shāh sent a letter to Mahmūd Shāh (Gujrātī) containing his thanks, and praised him for his help, and ² Sultān Mahmūd, turning back from the way, went to Ahmadābād in Gujrāt.

³ In the month of Dhīqa'dah of the same year Nizām Shāh became ill, and on account of that illness, he passed away to the vicinity of the great God

Couplet

Into the dust, was thrown that flower of state, which the
garden of empire

With a hundred thousand caresses, in its bosom, had
nourished

The period of his reign was ⁴ two years

each other from a distance, and sent gifts and presents for each other, and then went back to their respective capitals

¹ According to Firishtah, Nizām Shāh sent besides the letter, many wonderful presents and many elephants and horses in charge of some trusted servants and made many excuses for the trouble which he had given him

² The readings in the MSS as well as in the lith ed are incorrect. One MS has و سلطان محمود ار راء برگاه سلطه احمد اناء رمت and the other MS has the same reading, but leaves out the name محمود. The lith ed omits the initial و, and also the name محمود. The first reading is correct, but I have inserted the word گجراتی Gujrātī after Ahmadābād to make the meaning quite clear

³ Firishtah also does not say what Nizām Shāh died of, but he says that the queen-mother arranged great festivities for the marriage of Nizām Shāh, when suddenly at midnight, when the marriage ceremony was taking place sounds of wailing and lamentation were heard, and it was known that Nizām Shāh was dead

⁴ The period of his reign is given as one year and eleven days in one MS, and one year and eleven months and one day in the other, while the lith ed has two years. Firishtah says that Nizām Shāh died on the night of the 13th Dhīqa'dah, 867 A H, 29th July, 1463 A D, and he reigned for two years and one month

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF MUHAMMAD SHAH SON OF HUMAYŪN SHAH

When Muhammad Shah son of Humayun Shah sat on the *masnad* of sovereignty in his 10th year he in spite of his youth exerted himself in performing the duties of equity and justice. During the period of his rule all the people had repose in the cradle of peace and safety.

Couplet

To a tribe to whom God prosperity grants
He gives a sovereign just and wise and good

In all matters of government he had the custom of holding conferences with men of wealth. When physical greatness was combined with mental greatness he gave himself the title of Muhammad Shah Lashkarī and he entrusted the arrangement of all affairs and the execution of all business to his own wise opinion and his penetrating intellect. He considered that to be the best and wisest which the inspiration of his own greatness imprinted on the page of his mind and carried it into execution. Consequently the government of the kingdom and the greatness of the paraphernalia of power in the period of his rule reached to such a pitch that nothing higher than it could even be conceived. He enlisted a thousand Turkī slaves among his servants and advanced the grandees of that tribe to high ranks and great positions. Among these he ³granted

¹ Thus: the heading in the 11th ed. The MSS leave out the word ذكر *Ḍikr*. Firīhtah has a rather grandiloquent heading ذكر سامی سیم الدین *Ḍikr Sāmī Sīm al-Dīn* and the MSS leave out the word *Ḍikr*. *an account of the reign of* Shams ud dunyā wad dīn (the sun of the world and of religion) Abul Muzaffar Al Chāz Muhammad Shāh Bihmanī Lashkarī. The date of his accession appears to have been the 13th Dī qadah 867 A H July 30th 1463 A D.

Firīhtah says he was the second of the three sons of Humāyūn Shāh by Mahduma Jahan. The three were Nām Shah Muhammad Shah and Ahmad Shah. He also says that Muhammad Shah succeeded his brother in his ninth year.

³ The grant of these fiefs is not mentioned by Firīhtah nor does he say like Nizam ud dīn that the government was carried on by the nine or ten years.

Kāwīl to 'Imād-ul-mulk and Junūr to Nizām-ul-mulk and Māhūr to Khudāwand Khān, in *jāqīn*

¹ Unlike former Sultāns in the matter of the capture of forts and the conquest of towns he did not consider it sufficient merely to have a show of obedience and submission, and the sending of gifts and presents but he devoted all his attention to measures by which strong forts might come into his possession. In fact the *farmāns* of the rule of the Bahmanī dynasty ended with his great name ² and all disturbances and rebellions which had found their way into the kingdom during the reigns of Sultān Humāyūn Shāh and Nizām Shāh were remedied by the grandeur of the personality of Muhammad Shāh and all weaknesses and troubles which had crept into the affairs of the kingdom and empire were cured by his attention. After the regulation of the affairs of the empire, he commenced to gratify the hearts of the pillars of the state. He had Khwājah Jahān who in the invasion of Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had determined to undermine the foundation of the greatness of this dynasty, and had besides stretched out his hands for taking and misappropriating the government money ³ executed in front of the palace

old Sultān. On the other hand, he says that Khwājah Jahān Turk had all the power in his hands. He dispossessed all the ancient *amīns* of their fiefs, and made them over to new men, who were his own creatures. He even stretched his hands into, and embezzled the government funds. He kept Malik-ut-tujjār Muhammad Gāwān constantly employed on the frontier, and did not allow him to have any share in the great affairs of state. It was the queen mother who impressed the dishonesty and disloyalty of Khwājah Jahān on the Sultān's mind, and arranged for getting rid of him. It appears, moreover, that according to Frishtah, Muhammad Shāh could not even give the order for the execution of Khwājah Jahān, when everything had been previously arranged, without being specially reminded by his mother, through two old women.

¹ The meaning and logical sequence of these sentences is not very clear.

² There is some difference in the readings. I have retained that in the lith. ed. but the MSS. have instead of *نور شکوة و حود مـ و د شـ* to *ندوة او صلاح* simply *ندوة* *او صلاح بدیرو*.

³ See the latter part of note 2, above.

¹ He appointed Malik Nizam ul mulk the governor of Junir to conquer the fort of Kehrila which now belonged to the rulers of Mandū after giving him a special robe of honour. Malik Nizam ul mulk arranged his army and then with a large body of men traversed the various stages and encamped on the bank of the river which flows at the foot of the fort. ² The Mandu army sallied out of the fort and commenced the battle but afterwards again fled into the fort. Nizam ul mulk's soldiers pursued them to the gate of the fort. The garrison finding the grandeur and great strength of Nizam ul mulk's army prayed for safe conduct. Nizam ul mulk granted it and when they were brought out of the fort he gave *pan*

¹ According to Firishtah this expedition did not take place till the year 870 A.H. 1477 A.D. i.e. nearly four years after Muhammad Shah's accession and in the meantime Malik ut tujjar Muhammad Gavan was made *Khwajah Jahan* and *amir ul umra* and *takil us saltanat* and when Muhammad Shah was fourteen years of age the queen mother arranged for his marriage which was celebrated with great grandeur and éclat. After this the queen mother retired from active participation in the affairs of the state and devoted herself to devotional duties. But even now Muhammad Shah did not put his hand to any important affair till he had consulted her and went every morning to offer his respects to her.

He was made the *amir ul umra* commander of the army of Berar but Col Briggs makes him the governor of that territory.

² Firishtah's account is different. According to him Nizam ul mulk defeated the army which had come from Mandu to aid the garrison on the last occasion when twelve thousand Afghans and Rajputs fought a great battle with the Dakins in front of the fort but were signally defeated when the garrison which had sallied out to join in the fight attempted to re enter the fort. Nizam ul mulk and a small number of his soldiers pursued them and got into the fort and seized it. According to another version the garrison being disheartened surrendered the fort and were allowed to leave it in safety. At this time some of the Dakins abused and taunted the Malwa soldiers. Two Rajputs who were in the garrison determined to show their courage. After the fort had been evacuated they went near the crowd that surrounded Nizam ul mulk and said that they had never seen a great man like him and they wanted to show their respect by kissing his feet. Nizam ul mulk seeing that they had no arms allowed them to approach him when they snatched a dagger and a sword with great activity and each of them inflicted a wound and slew Nizam ul mulk. They attacked and slew others also and fought till they were both slain.

(betel) to each one of them with his own hand. When this was going on a man after taking the *pān*, struck Nizām ul-mulk with his dagger and made him a martyr. ¹ Ādil Khān and Daryā Khān, who were his two accomplished sons, slew the governor of the fort and the entire garrison and placing a man in whom they had every trust, in the fort and taking the dead body of their father with them, went to render homage to Muhammad Shāh. After they had had

¹ Firishtah calls them Yūsuf Ādil Khān Sawaf, who became the ancestor of the Ādil Shāhī Sultāns, and Daryā Khān Turk, and says that they were his adopted brothers, and not sons and also says that they believed that the Rājapūts had killed Nizām ul-mulk at the instigation of the commandant of the fort, and sent men in pursuit of the garrison, who had encamped one *korōh* from the fort, and were altogether unprepared, and every one of them, young and old, was killed.

Firishtah goes on to say that the Sultān of Mālwa sent a man of the name of Sharīf ul-mulk, with valuable presents, to represent that Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and Sultān Hūshang had entered into an agreement, that Berār should appertain to the Bahmanī kingdom, and Kehrla and its dependencies to Mālwa, so that there might be no further disputes. Now the *amīrs* of the Dakin had seized on Kehrla. If the matter be so arranged that there might be no breach of the previous agreement, there would be friendship and brotherliness between the two kingdoms. Sultān Muhammad sent Shāh Shaikh Ahmad the *Sadr*, with Sharīf-ul-mulk to Mandū, and pointed out that the Bahmanī Sultāns were not in need of any fort like Kehrla, as there were many such forts in the Carnātic, which were in the possession of the *kāfirs*, and which they could easily conquer. Besides, the first breach of the agreement was not committed by them but by Sultān Mahmūd himself, who had invaded the Bahmanī kingdom, when the late Sultān was a boy, and there was dissension among his principal officers. When Shāh Shaikh Ahmad arrived near Mandū, he was met by the principal officers of the Mandū government, who took him with all respect and honour to the Sultān. When he delivered his message the learned men of Mandū, who were present, and the Sultān himself admitted, that the first breach had been committed by Sultān Mahmūd himself. An agreement was then concluded and attested by the learned men and the representatives of the two Sultāns, that neither party should henceforward interfere with the other's territory, and the relations between them should be the same as had been agreed upon in the time of Sultān Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, and that Kehrla should be restored to Mālwa, and that for future expansion of their kingdoms, there were the territories of the *kāfirs*, which the contracting parties might with divine aid conquer by the sword of *jehād*. These transactions have not been mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn.

the good fortune of rendering service the rank and fiefs of their father were confirmed to them

¹ After some days he conferred a robe of honour and a jewelled belt to the Malik ut tujjar and sent him with some other *amirs* to conquer the territory of the Ray of Sonkar (Sangesar) and Kōkan. When the Malik ut tujjar arrived in the town of Kolapur As ad Khan advanced with his own men from Junir and Kishwar Khan from Gulbargah and Dabul and joined him. He started from that place in concert with them and when they arrived at the head of the ²defile of Kaikania they came to a great forest where on account of the dense growth of the trees it appeared to be difficult even for ants and snails to pass through. Malik ut tujjar's army cleared every day a distance of one *farsakh* in breadth and one bow shot in length. When they arrived in the vicinity of (the foot of) Kaikania the height and strength of which were such that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts could reach to the ³ambition of its conquest they encamped there. There was a great fight and the enemy (مردان) i.e. the refractory people fled and

¹ According to Firishtah this expedition was sent in the beginning of 814 A.H. 1469 A.D. for the punishment according to the lith ed of Firishtah of راجا سیدسر و کہنے و سحر دیگر و لاج کوکی i.e. of the Rays of Sangesar and Kāhna and the conquest of other forts in the Kōkan (Conkan). Col Briggs says that the expedition was against the Shunlur Ray of Kehlina and other refractory rajas in the Concan. As to Sankar or Sangesar see note p. 61.

Firishtah lith ed has the *pargana* and not the town of کہولا پور and Col Briggs the district of Kolapō. The name of As ad Khan is doubtful. It is so in the lith ed but one MS calls him استاد اسعد خان Istadad Khan and the other omits the name altogether. Firishtah has سعد خان گیلانی Sa'id Khan Gilāni but Col Briggs has Asad Khan. According to Firishtah after Malik ut tujjar had taken possession of the *ghāt* or pass seeing that the cavalry would not be of any use in that country he sent back the troops whom he had brought from the capital and took with him only Sa'id Khan Gilāni who was of his own tribe with the army of Junir and Kishwar Qadam Khan his own slave with the army of Dabul and Kalhar.

² I cannot find any mention of the بگی ٥٢٢ or the defile of Kaikania in Firishtah. It may be identical with جبل کہنے mentioned there.

³ The actual words are عوای سحر which means the ambition of its conquest as I have translated it.

entered the fort. The army was delayed at the foot of the fort for a period of ¹ five months. As the rainy season came on the *amīrs* after consulting among themselves, returned to Kolāpūr and on their arrival there, they cast the shadow of their good fortune on the capture of the fort of ² Rangta and seized it in a short time.

When the rainy season was over, the *amīrs* again directed their attention to the punishment of the Rāy of Sonkar, and when they arrived at the fort of ³ Māchal they attacked it and conquered it at the first onset and many of the rebels were slain, and some of their leaders were seized. When the overwhelming strength and power of the Malik-ut-tujjār became known, the Rāy of Sonkar sent a body of intelligent men to him, and prayed that he would pardon his offences, and he would ⁴ surrender the fort of Kaikanā to him. The Malik-ut-tujjār pardoned his offences, and having ⁵ placed the fort in charge of some trusted adherents, and made a

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have fifty days. The other MS. and Firishtah have پنجاه, five months.

² The name of the fort is رنگتہ in one MS. and رنگہ in the other. In the lith. ed. it is رنگہ. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has رامنگر, and Col. Briggs (vol. II, page 484) has Ramgur.

³ The fort is called ماچل, Māchal, in one MS., and ماچیل probably Māchīl in the other, and ماحال, Māhāl, in the lith. ed. It does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah.

⁴ Firishtah's account is rather vague. He says در این کرب بندیر و دیار و باشی درم و دیار بیسوار قلعه کهنه که در هیچ دورگار کهند سروان which may be translated as, "This time with many plans and stratagems and the scattering of many *dinams* and *dinārs*, the fort of Khīna, to the turrets to the capture of which, the lasso of the mighty emperors had not reached, in any (former) age, was taken." Col. Briggs's (vol. II, page 484) translation is less literal, but he also mentions the stratagems and gifts of money.

⁵ Firishtah says that after the capture of the fort Malik-ut-tujjār again left the *ghātī* and the fort in charge of men accustomed to the climate, and stayed for four months, as in the previous year (apparently at Kolāpūr), and then again invaded the territory of the Rāy, and took possession of it without difficulty, and having taken revenge from the *sardārs* for the outrage committed by them on Khalf Hasan Basrī, the former Malik-ut-tujjār, he started towards the island of Goa.

pecuniary allowance from the revenue of the country which might be sufficient for the subsistence of the Ray he without any hesitation or delay advanced towards the island of ¹Goa which is a famous port of Bijanagar. He sent by water 120 ships filled with ²war like men and in a short time the island came into his possession. When he returned (crowned with victory) and (larded with) plunder to the capital, his services were considered to be meritorious and were acceptable to the Sultan and the reigns of binding and loosening were placed in his hands of power and the title of *ʿAzam Humayūn Khwajah Jahan* was conferred on him.

As the armies of Muhammad Shah ⁴Lashkari were successful wherever they went and it had been repeatedly heard that in the kingdom of ⁵Jai Singh Ray proprietor of the fort of Birakar a mine

¹ Written as *كوة* in both MSS and in the lith ed of *Firishtah*. In the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* the name is printed as *كوة*. Mr Sewell (see page 99 of his book) says that In the middle of the year 1469 when Raja sek'hara or *Vīrūpākṣha* I was the king of Vijayanagar Mahmud Gawān Muhammad's minister marched towards the west and after a fairly successful campaign attacked Goa then in the possession of the Ray of Vijayanagar both by sea and land. He was completely victorious and captured the place.

The reading in one MS is *١٠٠ شہر* 100 ships and in the other *١٠٤ شہر* 104 boats. The lith ed has *١٠٤ شہر* 104 boats. *Firishtah* has the same reading as the first MS and I have accepted it. *Firishtah* also says that he himself marched by land with his victorious troops and that he returned to Ahmadābād Bidar after the conquest of the Concan and Goa after an absence of three years. The title conferred on Malik ut tujjār as described by *Firishtah* was much longer than that given by Nizām ud dīn. At the same time the Malik ut tujjār's slave Khush Qadam had the title of *Kishīr Khan* conferred on him and the forts of Goa and Banna (Briggs has Poonla) and Kondwāl and Kolapur were added to his former fief.

² There is a difference in the readings here. The MSS have *ملو* *ساحب* *مسعود* *ارمردم* *حنکی* *نیر راہی* *ساحب* which appears to be correct but the word *راہی* is rather indistinct. The lith ed has *نیر راہی* instead of *نیر راہی*.

⁴ Lashkari was one of the titles of Muhammad Shah and is appended to his name in the heading of the chapter about his reign in *Firishtah*. See note 1 page 93.

⁵ The name is doubtful. It is written as *راہی والی* *ملعہ* *نیراکر* or *راہی* in the MSS and *راہی* in the lith ed. *Firishtah* also gives him this name but Col Briggs (vol II page 489) calls him Ray Beejy Sing.

of diamonds had been found, 'Ādil Khān was sent with a body of *amīrs*, after a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt had been conferred on him. 'Ādil Khān in consultation with the other *amīrs* besieged the fort, and active and enterprising warriors advanced the batteries day after day, and made repeated assaults. In the end Jay Singh Rāy having no more strength left asked for an assurance of safety. 'Ādil Khān having drawn the pen of forgiveness across the page of his action, brought him out of the fort, and placing it in charge of his trusted adherents returned to the capital. Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī¹ conferred that territory on him as his fief.² After

I cannot find any mention of the diamond mine in Firishtah, but he says that Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān received many honours and distinctions from Muhammad Shāh, and was made the commander of the army of Daulatābād, and was appointed to conquer the fort of ویراکھرا, Wairākharā (Col Briggs has Wyragur, and says in a note, probably Woshagur, lying between Antoor and Ajunta) which appears to me to be identical with Birākar, and the recovery of the fort of انتور, Antūr, which had in the course of the troubles with Mālwa (the lith ed has مالوهیاں, but probably the last word is a mistake for مالوهیاں) come into the possession of a Marhatta. When Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān arrived at Daulatābād he nominated Qāsim Beg Safshikan to besiege Antūr, and sent Daryā Khān, whom he had given the name of brother (برادر خوانده حویس) to Wairakhara. The Hindū who held Antūr surrendered it without any contest, but the Rāja of Wairākharā whose name was Jamak Rāy (حیک رای), after fighting for five or six months, and finding himself unable to contend any longer, sent a message to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān offering to surrender the fort with all he had in it, if he was allowed to go out with his family in safety. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān agreed and sent an order accordingly to Daryā Khān, who allowed Jamak Rāy to leave the fort in safety. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān then came there post haste, and took possession of the fort, and all the treasures in it, and conciliated the chief men of the country with assurances of his protection. He then marched to the fort of لانهی, Lānhī (Col Briggs, vol II, page 489, has Ranjny and says in a note, probably Ranjungam, the chief town of the district of the same name), and the *rāzāda* of the place also surrendered it. This is, however, not mentioned by Nizām ud dīn.

¹ There is a difference in the readings. The MSS have ان ولایت را باقطاع, but the lith ed has ان ولایت را کہ باقطاع او مقرر کرده بود بر او مقرر داست قرار داست.

² The meaning is not at all clear, and the readings are doubtful. It is not clear to whom and why Malik-ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān spoke. The

a time Valik ut tujjar *Ihwajah* Jahan said that Birkana Ray had placed his foot outside the path of allegiance and having collected a very large army had advanced to the port of Goa. The Sultan advanced (against him) and besieged the fort of Birkana. This fort was so strong that the idea of taking it had never entered the mind of any conqueror of forts. It was built from its foundation to its turrets with chiselled stone and the breadth of each slab was three yards and its length was one yard and the height of its wall was

readings in the MSS are بعد از مدتی ملک النصار حواحه جهان گفت که زای برگسته قدم از حاده اطاع بنورن بهاده لسكر عظم بهم رسانده منوچه بندر گروہ سد و قلعه and بعد از مدت ملک النصار حواحه جهان گفت که زای برگسته قدم از حاده اطاع بنورن بهاده لسكر عظم بهم رسانده منوچه بندر گروہ سد سلطان منوچه سده قلعه برگسته را محاصره کرد

I do not think that either of the readings is strictly correct. I have adopted a reading which appears to me to be the best after comparing those in the MSS and the reading in the lith ed. *Firishtah's* version is that in 87 A H برگسته زای قلعه نلگاوان بنحرک حمزای فرمانده بنکانگر عارم رحریره 147 A D گردند. Col Briggs says: In the year 87 A H Birkana Ray (he says in a note the Oriental Scholar will recognize in this penult the language of the southern part of the peninsula but not knowing the Dravidian languages I cannot find out the meaning of this) Raja of the fortress of Belgam at the instigation of the Ray of Beejanuggur marched to retake the island of Goa. As regards Belgam Col Briggs says that it is now occupied by British troops and is deemed one of the strongest on the plain in that part of the country. The name of the Ray as given by Nizam ud din has some resemblance to that in *Firishtah* but Nizam ud din does not give the name of the fort though in one place he gives it the same name as that of the Ray. Mr Sewell on page 100 of *A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar* gives another translation of the part of *Firishtah* relating to this matter. In it the Ray is called Parkna and the fortress Balgaon which is nearer the Persian than the name in the translation by Col Briggs. Mr Sewell goes on to say that the Burhan i Maasir calls the chief of Belgaum Parkatapatah and Major King the translator of the work gives a large variety of the spellings of the name viz Brkanah Parka tabtah Parlatiyah Parkitah Barkabith (*Ind Ant* Nov 1899 page 86 note). Briggs gives it as B rkana. It has been supposed that the real name was Vikrama. Mr Sewell does not say from whom and on what authority the supposition emanated. It appears to me that the real name may be Pratap or some derivative from that word.

thirty yards, and the breadth of the moat forty yards. ¹ In short, Birkāna Rāy bravely waited in the fort with three thousand horse-men for battle and bloodshed. Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī built a second wall around the fort, in order to shut up all ingress and egress, and distributed the batteries (amongst his *amīrs*). The batteries were advanced every day, till after filling up the moat with rubbish and grass, they were taken close to the wall, and the victory became a matter of to-day or to-morrow. Birkāna now, owing to his great exhaustion and weakness sent a *talīl*, and agreed to render allegiance, and pay tribute. Muhammad Shāh having drawn the pen of pardon across his offences, gave him assurances of safety, and brought him out of the fort. He entrusted that part of the country to Khwājah Jahān, and returned (to the capital).

² In the year 880 A.H., news came that the ³ Rāy of Orissa had marched into the Deccan from his own country, with an enormous

¹ Firishtah's account differs from that in the text, inasmuch as he says that the Rāy at once offered his submission, but Muhammad Shāh refused to accept it, and carried on the siege with great vigour. The moat was filled up, and mines were blown up, and the fort was taken. There are different accounts of how the Rāy appeared before the Sultān just before the fort was taken, and asked for quarter, and the Sultān "pardoned his offences", and enlisted him in the band of his *amīrs*. According to Firishtah, it was after he had taken this fort, that Muhammad Shāh gave himself the title of "*Lashkharī*".

² Nizām-ud-dīn altogether omits to mention the great famine, which depopulated the Bahmanī kingdom during the next two years. Firishtah says, that on his return journey after taking Belgāun, the Sultān wanted to pass the rainy season in Bījāpūr, but there was, during that year, want of rain in the Dakin, and all the wells in Bījāpūr were dried up, so the king was compelled to move to Ahmadābād Bidar. The next year also there was no rain, and town and city and village all became depopulated, and men died, and those who survived took shelter in Mālwa and Gujrāt and Jājnagar. For two years no seed was sown in Tilang and Mālwa and Marhat and the whole of the Bahmanī kingdom, and in the third year, when "The breezes of Divine favour blew, and there was rain, there was none left who might engage in the work of cultivation." In his translation Col. Briggs leaves out the name of Mālwa in the last sentence, apparently to avoid a seeming contradiction with the preceding sentence. He explains Marhatt by the word "Maharashtra," in a note.

³ Firishtah's account is different. He says that when the Dakin was recovering from famine and pestilence, news came that the garrison of کندیپر (Kandnīr, in the lith. ed., Condapilly in Briggs, and Kondapalle in Sewell)

and had plundered and devastated portions of it and gone back to his own country. Muhammad Shah sent Mahkīm ul mulk with a large army to chastise and punish the Rājā after some days intelligence arrived that Nizam ul mulk had

slain the ruler who was a vicious tyrant and who violated the honour the property of his subjects and made the fort over to Hamirā Orīā in the lith ed. Bheem Rāj Oorea according to Col Briggs) who been a *protegé* of Muhammad Shāh. Hamirā sent men to the Rājā of a and incited him to invade the Dakin and told him that there were no wars in that country on account of the famine which had lasted for two years he would be easily able to conquer Tilang and if he made it over to Hamirā the latter would surrender the fort of Kandnir and its dependencies to him. The Rājā of Orissa was deceived and with one thousand horsemen six or seven thousand infantry and taking the Rājā of Jajmāndī with him invaded Tilang. Nizam ul mulk Basrī the governor of Rājmandī being unable to meet him shut himself up in the fort and sent a representation of the facts to the Sultān. The latter paid a year's wages to the soldiers and ordered immediately. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the enemy the latter did not think it advisable to fight and Hamirā shut himself up in the fort of Kandnir. The Rājā of Orissa crossed the Rājmandī river (i.e. Godavari) and encamped on the bank of the river on the side of his own territory. The Sultān arrived near the river and Nizam ul mulk joined him could not however at once cross the river and when he had got the boats the Rājā marched away and went back to his capital. The Sultān however highly incensed at his conduct and left Shāhzada Mahmud Khān and the rajah Jahān there and himself advanced with twenty thousand horse to punish that *kufr*. Towards the end of 887 A.H. he arrived at the capital of Orissa and plundered and ravaged the country. The Rājā had left the central part of his territory unprotected and had fled to the extreme end of it so the Sultān stayed in the capital for six months and obtained much treasure and wealth both by peaceful means and by violence. He then wanted to summon the Shāhzada and the Khwājah and to make the country over to them. The Rājā hearing this sent presents and elephants to him and said that he would not again help the *zamindārs* of Tilang. The Sultān demanded twenty other elephants which had belonged to the Rājā's father and were very valuable. The Rājā had to comply and the Sultān then returned towards his kingdom. On the way he besieged a fort belonging to the Rājā because the people of the neighbourhood told him that no one had ever before dared attack it but he raised the siege on the Rājā having apologized for the madness of those ignorant and boorish people. Then he besieged Kandnir for six months when Hamirā in great distress surrendered it to him.

fled from him, and had gone towards ¹ Zībād. The spirit of the Sultān being now excited he marched out of the city and advanced by successive marches in the direction of Rājmandrī and ² when he arrived near it, he left Khwājah Jahān in attendance on the Shāhzāda, and advanced himself with twenty thousand selected horsemen and marching rapidly went to Rājmandrī. When he arrived near it, he found a wide expanse of water, the breadth of which was about one *farsakh* before him. Muhammad Shāh was compelled to draw rein there. The Rāy of Orissa had encamped on the opposite bank of the river with seven *lakhs* of infantry and a number of elephants. When he found that Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī had arrived there in person, he left Rāy Mān, who was one of his principal chiefs, in the fort of Rājmandrī, and fled. The following day the Sultān nominated Dairā Khān to pursue the Rāy of Orissa, and himself encamped around the fort of Rājmandrī. He built a second wall round the fort to stop the entrances and exits of the fort, and having distributed the batteries amongst his commanders, planned the erection of covered ways. After four months when the covered ways had been completed, and the soldiers were able to overlook the garrison, Rāy Mān seeing his own death with the eye of certainty, asked for protection, in great humility and distress, and surrendered the fort, and sent an elephant, which he had in the fort, as tribute, and enlisted himself among the servants (of Muhammad Shāh). The latter confirmed him in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood, and returned to his capital. He raised the men who had performed great deeds in the expedition to high ranks and noble positions. It is however mentioned in the *Tabaqāt Bahādurī*, that the fort of Rājmandrī was not conquered, but the Rāy of Orissa paid tribute, and turned Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī off from all thought of him.

And the intoxication and madness of warfare had not passed from the head of the Sultān, when news was brought that the men

¹ The name of the place is زيباد in one MS, and زيباد in the other and in the lith ed.

² This agrees with Firishtah. See note 24, pp 151 and 152. The wide expanse of water is apparently the Godāvari.

of Orissa had come back and had overrun some villages and *parganas* and had taken the fort of ¹Bakir by fraud and deceit Muhammad Shah started from the vicinity of his capital at the moment which was chosen by the astrologers and by repeated marches proceeded to the country of Tilang. He besieged the fort of ²Kandar when the *thanadar* of the place after much distress and lamentation sought the Sultan's protection and ³surrendered the fort. The Sultan started from there to view the sea and proceeded to the ⁴ports of Narsingh Ray and after amusing himself with a sight of the sea he took tribute from Narsingh Ray and started for the capital. He ordered the erection in those parts of a high and strong fort in the course of one month for the *thanadars*. At the time of his return in the year 879 A.H. the *ra'is* told him that there was a city on the border of Tilang which was celebrated as ⁵Kanji and which was full of gold and gems and was one of the

¹ The name of the fort appears to be بکیر Bakir in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is گبر Gir. In the text edition the name of the fort is not mentioned.

² The name is کددار Kand r in one MS. کد Kand in the other. کد Kandah in the lith. ed. and گول کد Gol Kadda in the text edition.

³ There are some variations in the readings. I have adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best.

⁴ Firishtah does not refer indefinitely to the ports of Narsingh Ray but mentions one of them Machilipatan which he says belonged to the kingdom of Narsingh Ray and which he says Muhammad Shah conquered. As for Narsingh Ray or Nara Simha as he taking the Sanskrit form of the name calls him Mr Sewell (p. 10-) says that he "Owing to his numerous army and the extent of his dominions was the greatest and most powerful of all the rulers of Talingana and Vijayanagar and had established himself in the midst of the country of Kanara and Talingana and taken possession of most of the districts of the coasts and interior of Vijayanagar." Mr Sewell's account appears to have been taken from the Burhan-i-Ma'athir.

⁵ This city is known in Sanskrit books as Kanchi or Kanchipuram and is now known as Conjeevaram. Firishtah's account of the way in which the existence of Kanji came to the notice of the Sultan was that when he arrived at Kondpūrpalī some people of that place reported to him that there was a temple at a distance of ten days' journey from there which was called Kanji and the doors and walls and roofs of which were adorned with gold and jewelled ornaments and decorated with rubies and other fine gems and not one of the Muslim kings had up to that time set eyes on it and had not even heard

great places of worship of the Hindūs and it was ten days' journey from ¹Nilwāra Muhammad Lashkarī selected one thousand men and started for Kanjī by forced marches. When he arrived there, there were only forty horsemen in attendance on him. The soldiers galloped into the city and plundered and ravaged it. The Sultān stayed there for ten days and then returned to the capital.

In the year 886 A H ²some interested persons in Golkonda, said that the coming of the Rāy of Orissa into the Sultān's dominion

its name. Sultān Muhammad detached six thousand horsemen adorned with daggers and started on a rapid march to the place, and ordered Shāh-zāda Mahmūd Khān to remain there, and it appears from the concurrent testimony of all the historians, that the Sultān rode so fast that not more than forty horsemen could remain with him.

¹ The name is نِيلَوَارَا, Nilwāra, in both MSS and نِيلَوَارَا, Nilwāra, in the lith ed. As will be seen from the preceding note, Kānjī was, according to Frishtah, ten days' journey from Kondpūrpalli, which Col Briggs calls Condapilly. Frishtah's account of what happened at Kānjī is somewhat different. According to him there was some hand to hand encounters between the Sultān and the members of his guard, and some Hindūs of gigantic stature, who were the guardians of the temple. These went on till the Hindūs were compelled to retire into the temple, and when the rest of the Sultān's escort arrived, the Sultān entered the temple, and looted it, and slew the men who were inside it. Mr Sewell quoting from Frishtah says (p 101) that "the Sultān went to Kondapalle (which he says in a note, Scott, I, p 166, calls Ghondpore and Briggs, II, p 500, Condapilly), and there was told that at a distance of ten days' journey was the temple of Kunchy, the walls and roof of which was plated with gold and ornamented with precious stones." In a note he says, "this evidently means Kānchi or Conjeeveeram, but the story is exceedingly improbable. The distance was 250 miles, and the way lay through the heart of a hostile country." Further on quoting the Buhān i-Ma'āthir, he says (p 102) that "when Sultān Muhammad was at Mālūr which belonged to Narasimha, who was the greatest and most powerful of the rulers of Talingana and Vijayanagar, he was informed that at a distance of fifty *farsakhas* from his camp was a city called Gangi, containing temples, etc, to which he promptly marched, arriving before the place on the 13th March, A D 1481 (11th Muharram A H 886). He sacked the city and returned."

² According to Frishtah, Malik ut-tujjār Khwājah Jahān introduced various reforms, as regards the subdivision of the country, and the government of the forts, and the payment of the troops. They were all excellent, but they caused much discontent. The minister knew it, but he disregarded it, having great confidence in himself and his friends. The chief among the latter was Yūsuf

was at the summons and incitement of Malik ut tujjar Khwajah Jahan. In support of their statement they produced a letter which bore the seal of the Khwajah (and which they said) he had written to the Ray of Orissa. As a matter of fact they had given a piece of gold to the seal bearer of the Khwajah Jahan and had got his seal impressed on a piece of white (blank) paper. They wrote the matter on that paper and brought it under the eye (of the Sultan). When some one went to summon the Khwajah although his slaves told him that as on account of his wealth there were ten thousand horses in his stable and there were ten thousand Turki slaves in attendance on him it was right and proper that he should go away to Gujrat the Khwajah said I have committed no offence why should I run away? I have every hope that the right should be separated from the wrong and the truth from falsehood. As the hand of death brought the simple minded Khwajah by the nape of the neck to attend on Muhammad Lashkari that letter was shown to him and without any enquiry being made in the matter he was put to death on the

Adl Khan his adopted son and he knew that while the latter was with him his enemies could not be able to do anything against him. Then Yusuf Adl Khan was sent against Narsingh Ray and the minister's enemies entered into a conspiracy to effect his destruction. The details of the conspiracy are the same as in the text but the names of the conspirators and some other particulars are mentioned. The chief conspirators were Zarif ul mulk Dakin and Miftah Habshi and Malik Hasan Nizam ul mulk Bahri. The two former and other Hindi slaves became intimate with a Habshi slave of the minister who was his seal bearer and bribed him with money and gems and delicate articles of food and different kinds of Arab horses etc. and one day in a convivial assembly when the slave was inebriated Zarif ul mulk and Miftah Habshi produced a piece of paper which was twisted up and said it was an account of one of the friends to which most of the ministers or heads of departments had affixed their seals and they asked him to affix the Khwajah's seal to it also. The slave very foolishly affixed his master's seal without unfolding and looking at the paper. A letter purporting to be written by the minister to the Ray of Orissa was forged on this paper and it was produced before the Sultan and he without making any enquiry in the matter sent for the minister. What the latter said and did on receiving the summons what his adherents suggested and what happened after he had come to the Sultan's presence are narrated in somewhat greater detail and with more picturesque details by Firishtah but there is no real difference in the substance. The date of the execution is given as 5th Safar 880 by Firishtah.

3rd of Safar of that year. He lived nobly and died a martyr. may the mercy of God be on him! Khwājah Jahān Khwājah Mahmūd Gīlānī was among the most learned men of the age, and was distinguished for great perfection in literary work. He wrote an elegant book on letter-writing and included in it the letters which he had written to the great and noble men and named it the ¹ *Riḡād ul-inshā*. He also sent presents and gifts to the men of his age in K̲h̲urāsān and 'Irāq and 'Arab and 'Ajām. more specially he sent letters to His Holiness Maulānā 'Abd ur-Rahmān Jāmī. may his tomb be sanctified and gave expression to his veneration and respect for him. His Holiness the saint also believing in his sincerity and faith in himself sent him epistles which are extant in his correspondence. Among the *qasīdas* in his collected poems there is a *qasīda*, which he specially composed in the name of the Khwājah. The opening couplet of it is

² Couplet

Welcome! oh messenger of the land of the heart welcome!
Welcome for I have devoted my life and heart to thee
welcome!

He has also said in it

Couplet

To the world he is K̲h̲wājah to *faqī* (poverty with contentment) he is the preface
There is the secret of *faqī*, but under the veils of wealth,
and in a *ghazl* (ode) he has said
Jāmī! thy heart-stuning verse is an article fine

¹ Firishtah calls the book, the Raudat ul-inshā

² These and the following lines are all quoted by Firishtah also but in the second line of the first couplet نرل is substituted for بدل means a present placed before a guest when he first comes, and may be correct. At the end of the first line of the second couplet the words اوست are added and in the beginning of the second line آیت, sign or mark, is substituted for فلت. In the lines from the *ghazl* which is called a *qit'ah* by Firishtah, the second line is بودش از حسن و لطف معانی نارس and in the fourth line مهر is substituted for مهر

Of that article the charm is from the sweetness of the spirit

Send it with the caravan to India that it may receive
The honour of the seal of acceptance of Malik ut tujjar

¹In short the execution of that victim the *Khujajah* was not auspicious for Muhammad Lashkari. After a few days he became ill and although his physician Sharf i Jahan attended on and treated him it was of no avail and on the first day of Rabi ul āwwal he passed away. The period of his reign was nineteen years four months and fifteen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SHIHAB UD DIN MAHMUD SHAH SON OF MUHAMMAD SHAH LASHKARI

Sultan Shihab ud din Mahmud Shah who was the rightful son of Sultan Muhammad Lashkari ascended and sat on the throne

¹Firishtah's account of the reign after the execution of the Malik ut tujjar is not so short as that of Nizam ud din. There is not much of interest in what he says but he mentions the fact that there were many remains of the great minister in Ahmadabad Bidar specially a college built by him. A note by Col Briggs says that a great portion of this building was demolished by an explosion of gun powder which was stored in it after Aurangzib had captured Bidar but what remained still attested to its grandeur. Firishtah gives an account of the life of the minister as given by Mulla Abd ul Karim Hamadani. Col Briggs changes Hamadani to Sindi. Firishtah also gives an account of the attempts made by Muhammad Shah to get hold of the wealth which the minister was supposed to have left behind but it was found that he had left none having spent all his revenue in charity etc. When he became convinced of the innocence of the minister Muhammad Shah ordered that his remains should be conveyed to Bidar for interment. Firishtah goes on to say that after this the nobles all separated from Muhammad Shah and the latter knowing that an attempt to enforce his authority would end in civil war refrained from doing so. He halted for three months at Fuzabad endeavouring to beguile the time in pleasure. He proclaimed his son Shahzadah Mahmud to be his successor. After that he grew weak and his illness was increased by frequent indulgence in intoxicating liquors. He died according to Firishtah on the 1st Safar 887 A.H. 24th March 1487 i.e. about eleven months after the date mentioned by Nizam ud din and the period of his reign was twenty years. Mr Sewell gives 11th Muharram 886 A.H. 1st March 1486. The Hijri date is more than a year anterior to that given by Firishtah.

Nizam ul mulk but as the Turki *amirs* were many in number their party was the stronger of the two. Owing to this the fiery furnace of the envy of Nizam ul mulk and all the Indian nobles was inflamed. At last by the exertions of the great and the noble they entered into agreements with one another and confirmed them with strong oaths. But the perfidious Nizam ul mulk taking the thread of flattery in his hand and having made the simple minded Qiyam ul mulk careless and negligent stated one day that Ādil Khan and Darya Khan and Mallu Khan and certain others wanted that they should after receiving permission go back to their respective *thanas* or posts. They were however owing to a fear which they had in their hearts in respect of the Turki *amirs* unable to come out of their houses. It would be advisable that on the day they should receive permission to leave the Turki *amirs* should remain in their houses. Malik Qiyam ul mulk agreed to this proposal and on the following day

friendship of Nizam ul mulk and as his destruction was at hand did not attend to the *kotwal's* warning. Ādil Khan Dakin and Fath ul lah Imad ul mulk then came into the city with their respective troops from Tlang and Kawil and were honoured by being allowed to salute the Sultān. The latter who was a puppet in the hands of Nizam ul mulk's party sent for the chief of the two troops to the top of the bastion and told them that the Turk slaves were committing excesses and should be punished. Fath ul lah Imad ul mulk who was on terms of sincere attachment to Yusuf Ādil Khan guarded him in the *melee* and Ādil Khan Dakin and his troops were ordered to massacre the Turks. Qiwwām ul mulk was first murdered and Farhad ul mulk the *kotwal* was put into prison and other Turks were killed. Yusuf Ādil Khan and his followers fought their way to the city gate and brought in Darya Khan who had twenty two thousand troops according to one statement and ten thousand according to another and there were skirmishes in the city for twenty days between the two parties till the learned and wise men intervened and proposals were made for peace. Yusuf Ādil Khan with his adherents went away to Bijpur.

It will be seen from the above the Qiwwām ul mulk or Qiyam ul mulk was not so simple minded as Nizam ul mulk makes him out to be. Firishtah also calls him simple minded (سادہ لوح) in one place but it appears that he had treacherous designs against Yusuf Ādil Khan. Firishtah goes on to say that after peace had been established the whole power rested with Nizam ul mulk for a period of four years during which time he and Imad ul mulk acted in concert with the queen mother. Firishtah also gives the names of the nobles on whom *jagirs* and offices were conferred.

Darjā Khān and 'Ādil Khān and all the Khāns, having made all preparations, entered the fort with their troops. Farhād-ul-mulk Turk, the *lotuāl*, sent information to Malik Qiyām-ul-mulk that the *amīrs* had come with treacherous designs, but as the latter was doomed to die, he did not listen to it. The traitorous *amīrs* first seized Farhād-ul-mulk the *lotuāl* and then put Qiyām-ul-mulk to death. After that they shut up the Turkī *amīrs* in their houses, and brought them out one by one, and murdered them. After Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk had been killed Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik 'Imād-ul-mulk took up the duties of the post of the *razī* and attended to all affairs in concert with Malka-i-Jahān, the mother of Sultān Mahmūd. The duties of the *lotuāl* of the capital were entrusted to Malik Barīd, who was a Turkī slave of Sultān Mahmūd.

¹ When some time had passed in this way, one day Dilāwar Khān Habshī submitted privately to Mahmūd Shāh that Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk still considered the Sultān to be too young, and settled all matters themselves. He then obtained the permission of the Sultān to assassinate both the ministers, and waited for an opportunity. It so happened that the two *razīs* went one night to wait on the Malka-i-Jahān for the arrangement of certain matters connected with the government. When they were coming out, Dilāwar Khān with another man attacked them with swords at the gate of the palace. Nizām-ul-mulk was wounded, but as both had great skill in swordsmanship they came out of the

¹ The account of the attempt of Dilāwar Khān on the lives of Nizām ul-mulk and 'Imād ul-mulk as given by Firishtah is very similar to that in the text. But Firishtah says that Dilāwar Khān was envious of the ministers' power. Firishtah does not say where Nizām ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-mulk went. He only says that they went out of the city, and they informed Malik Barīd, that the Sultān had designs against his life, and Malik Barīd shut up the gates of the citadel, so that no one could get any access to the Sultān. The latter in great distress repented of the orders he had passed, and sent men to apologize to the ministers, and to ask them to return. They refused to do so, unless the Sultān ordered the execution of Dilāwar Khān. The latter on hearing this fled to the country of Asīr and Buhānpūr (i.e., Khāndesh). After that Nizām-ul-mulk and his son Malik Ahmad came back to the city, but Fath-ul-lah 'Imād-ul-mulk went away to Berāi. These events have not been mentioned by Nizām ud dīn.

mele with the strength of their arms. They sent for Mahl Barid the same night (and informed him) that Dilwar Khan wanted also to murder him. Early the next morning both the *amirs* came out (of their houses) and bade adieu to each other and Mahl Nizam ul mulk started for Junir and Imad ul mulk for Kawil which were their fiefs and remained there. On hearing this news the *amirs* became dispersed and great irregularity and weakness crept into the Sultan's affairs and gradually Mahl Barid kept him as if in imprisonment. His *ie* the Sultan's power was weakened and the men of the city made an attack on him. On the ¹ night

¹ The meaning of the text is not quite clear. The rebel are said to have made the elephant keepers etc. join them and yet the elephant keepers are said to have made themselves the shields or defenders of him (وی) which being in the singular would refer to the Sultan and not to the rebels. Besides it is said that from amongst them (اراجله) Aziz Khan and four others resolved to devote their lives to save him. Firishtah's account is that from the year 890 the flames of envy and jealousy of the Muslims and Turks were burning in the hearts of the Abyssinians and the Dakins. They tried to induce the Sultan to cast them out of his favour but it was of no avail. Then Dilpasand Khan (Col Briggs calls him Pussund Khan) conspired with all the Dakins and Habshis that they would assassinate Mahmud Shah and would place another prince of the Bahmani dynasty on the throne. With this object they got all the residents of the fort namely the elephant keepers the chamberlains or ushers the guards the men in charge of the furniture and the gate keepers to join them. Then at nightfall on the 1st Dhigadah 89 A H the same date as that given by Nizam ud din about a thousand of them fully armed some on horseback and some on foot entered the citadel of the fort where the Sultan had his abode and shut the gates of the fort from inside for fear of the Turks and Muslims coming to help the Sultan. Then before the Sultan could guard himself some of them came to the place where he was reposing but Aziz Khan and four other Turks and Hasan Ali Khan Sabzwari and Sayid Mirza Mahadi threw themselves between the Sultan and the rebels and offered their lives in his defence. The Sultan then got away on the terrace of the *Shahburi* and the fight continued in somewhat like the manner of Nizam ud din's narrative till the rebels were driven out. Firishtah in some places uses the same phraseology as Nizam ud din but his narrative is more consistent and logical.

Col Briggs's translation is defective. He gives the year as 896 A H calls Dilpasand Khan Pussund Khan and does not say that the men inside the fort were in conspiracy with the rebels outside except that he mentions incidentally that the rebels were admitted by the porters who were privy to the plot.

of the 21st *Dhīqā'dah* in the year 892 A H, a body of the ungrateful wretches, having united all the people in the fort including the elephant-keepers and the ¹chamberlains or ushers, and the guards or sentries and the men in charge of the furniture (*parda-dārān*) with themselves, treacherously attacked their own sovereign prince. They did not know that

Couplet

Those whom God's protection doth guard

No danger comes from the revolution of the skies ¹

At that time Mahmūd Shāh had spread the bed of pleasure when a great tumult arose in the fort. All the men taking up their arms hastened towards the palace. The elephant-keepers started after equipping their mounts, and they made the men in charge of the furniture their confederates. 'Azīz Khān Turk and Hasan 'Alī Khān and Sayyid Mīzā-i-Mashhadī who had the title of Mallū Khān came into the field of conflict, and made themselves his shields. From amongst them, a brave young man of the name of 'Azīz Khān, who was distinguished for his great bravery and courage, offered to sacrifice his dear life, with four other Turks for the Sultān's safety. The latter taking advantage of this opportunity took shelter on the roof of the *Shāhburj* (bastion). The seraglio and the *Shāhburj* and the whole of the fort fell into the hands of the rebels, who fastened all the doors, so that the loyal and faithful adherents could not enter the fort. Some of the soldiers, however, climbed to the top of the *Shāhburj* from the surrounding moat by means of ropes, and drove away the rebels from its ²neighbourhood, wounding them with their life-destroying arrows. ³Some men set fire to things, and

¹ The word is *ناہیال* in one MS, and in the lith. ed. and *ناحیل* in the other MS. The word in the corresponding passage of *Firishtah* is *حاجدن* chamberlains or ushers. The next word in both MSS, and in the lith. ed. is *کوبوال*, but in *Firishtah* it is *کوبوالان*. I have adopted *ناحیل*, and *کوبوالان*.

² The word is *حویلی* in the MSS, though in one of them there is what looks like a dot near the top of the *ح* so that the word looks like *حویلی*. In the lith. ed. the word is *حویلی* or a house, and *حول* neighbourhood. I think the reading in the lith. ed. is correct.

³ This is explained by *Firishtah*, who says that the sweepers and *farrāshes* (men in charge of carpets, etc.) and other menial servants (Col. Briggs groups

the elephants fled in panic out of the fort. When the tumult and the disturbance ceased in the fort (he i.e. I suppose the Sultan) gave order that ¹ Jahangir Khan who was Malik Nizam ul mulk should guard the gate and Khan Jahin leaving the fort should guard the city and the bazar with his own men. When half the night was over and the moon rose troops came from all sides and gathered together in the courtyard of the *Shahburi*. He then ordered that the Arabian horses which were bred in the royal stables should be distributed among the men and they mounted on them should completely destroy those men of evil destiny. When the auspicious morning dawned some of the latter threw themselves into the moat and broke their necks and some became food for the sword. Some concealed themselves in the rat holes ² (موس حانها) but after two or three days they were dragged out and got the meed of their deeds.

- It is written in history that one day a messenger came from Adil Khan and submitted a representation from him to the effect that the *amirs* of that *suda* had at the instigation of Dastur ul mulk raised the standard of disturbance and rebellion and that that slave (i.e. he himself) relying on the grandeur of the good fortune of His Majesty had with the help of Fakhr ul mulk dispersed them

them all as the servants of the palace) who had first joined the enemy and had got them into the fort at this time showed their loyalty and devotion and set fire to some fodder. Col Briggs says they set fire to the straw roofs under which numbers were concealed.

¹ This man is called Sultan Jahangir Khan Turk who had the title of Malik ul maut in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* and it is said there that he was ordered to guard the gate of the fort. Col Briggs calls him Sooltan Jehangeer Khan Toork. He says nothing about his having any title and says now took charge of the palace gates (vol II page 34).

² I cannot find any reference to this in *Firishtah* but probably what is narrated below refers to the same events but the account is brief and the names do not agree. I am quoting from Col Briggs (vol II page 59).

In the year 891 Adil Khan Deccany governor of Wurungole died when Kowamool Moolk junior came by forced marches from Rajmundry to that city and established himself in Tulingana. Nizamool Moolk accompanied by the King marched towards Wurungole on which Kowamool Moolk falling back on Rajmundry wrote secretly to the King warning him against the minister.

It was however, now, reported again that they had collected together, and 'Azīz-ul-mulk had joined them

Couplet

They have nothing in their heads except rebellious thoughts,
There is no remedy except marching against them for war

Immediately on receiving this intelligence, the Sultān ordered the *amīrs* who were on his side that they should march in concert for the punishment of that body of evil destiny, and he himself with one thousand Turkī slaves (guards) marched on the wings of speed. At each stage of the journey, the *amīrs* came and joined them. When they arrived in the vicinity of Rājmundhī, he on the next day made over the arrangement of the right and left wing to Malīk Fakhr-ul-mulk, and marched to the field of battle, and the evil starred rebels also advanced to meet them and arrayed their ranks. 'Ādil Khān, who was the commander of the right wing, fought bravely, and defeated the rebels. Dastūr-ul-mulk who was the head and leader of the rebels was seized, and the warriors pursued the enemy and cast most of those wretches on the dust of destruction. Some of the men, however, carried half a life away with great difficulty. When Mahmūd Shāh came back to the camp, from the battle-field, with victory and triumph, he at the request of 'Ādil Khān pardoned the guilt and offence of Dastūr-ul-mulk, who had absurd thoughts in his head, and giving him back all his property, which had been escheated to the government, confirmed him in the rank, which he had formerly held. Then he arranged all the affairs of state with the advice and concurrence of the *amīrs*, and returned to Gulbarga.

After some days news came that a body of the men, who had fled, had shut themselves up in the fort of Sunkar. Mahmūd Shāh, in concert with the loyal *amīrs*, proceeded by successive marches, and besieged the fort, and enterprising warriors at the first onset captured the lower fort (سنگار اول). The garrison then betook themselves to the upper citadel, and when they saw that they had not the strength to make further resistance they prayed for safety and surrendered the fort. Mahmūd Shāh left one of his trusted men in the fort, and returned to the city of Bīdar. According to the custom of former Sultāns, he made the different ranks of the great and noble men fortunate by the granting of rewards.

In the year 896 A.H. ¹ Bahadur Gilāni who was one of the servants of Khwajah Mahmud Khwajah Jahān and was also in charge of the *thana* had raised the dust of rebellion and had taken forcible possession of certain *parganas* and also of the port of Dabul. He had equipped some ships and had stretched hands of oppression and tyranny over the ports of Gujrat so that the passage over the sea was closed. It so happened also that some ship belonging to Sultan Mahmud Gujrati had fallen into his hands and he had plundered everything that was contained in them and had cast Sultan Mahmud's men into prison. Another version of the incident is that as merchants and the servants ^{موردی} of merchants complained of Bahadur Gilāni's acts Sultan Mahmud sent Kamal Khan and Safdar Khan with some troops some of whom were to go by water and some to march by land (with order) that they should cast the boat of his (i.e. Bahadur's) life in the whirlpool of destruction. As Kamal Khan and Safdar Khan went on horses that travelled on the wind (i.e. ships) the bridle of (their) power fell into the wind (i.e. I suppose they were caught in a storm) and contrary winds carried their ships to a great distance from one another. Bahadur sent a man to express his allegiance. When Kamal Khan and Safdar Khan came and joined him with a small body of men he at once meditated treachery towards them and there was a great battle. So much blood and water got mixed together that the water took the colour of a bright ruby. In the end Kamal Khan and Safdar Khan received wounds and fell into Bahadur's hands and he sent them to Dabul.

When this news reached Sultan Mahmud he appointed Qiwan ul mulk with fifty thousand horsemen to attack Bahadur. When

¹ Firishtah gives the following account of the antecedents of Bahadur Gilāni: he was a servant of Malik ut tujjar Ikhwajah Mahmud Gilāni. After the latter's martyrdom he became a servant of Najm ud din Gilāni and when the latter was in charge of the port of Coa he became the *lotwal* of that town and became known for his bravery and courage. When Najm ud din died the thought of hostility (^{مخالفت}) or more correctly rebellion entered his mind and in the year 889 he took possession of Coa and the entire chief of Kishwar Khan and in a short time he seized Dalul and Chaul and Kalhar and Pinala and Kolapur and Sarāla and Nīlgavān and Mirch.

Qiwām ul mull arrived at Mahim, he made enquiry about the different roads. It was at last found out that it would be difficult to reach their destination unless they went by way of a part of the Deccan. So after attending certain matters he came down to the court, marching with great rapidity, so that he might represent the true state of things and obtain permission to troop into the Dakhni kingdom.

Sultān Mahmūd Shāh Gujrātī, coming to his senses, had sent a letter to Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī to the purport that it was a life time, since the chain of friendship which existed between the two parties had been strengthened, and the noble alliance between them had come to them in the form of an inheritance and from this side (i.e. from him self) there had been no default in the discharge of the rights of friendship. When," he went on to say, "Sultān Mahmūd Khuljī had seized the Deccan from the late Sultān Nizām Shāh, if I had not helped the latter with my army he would have lost his kingdom. At this time it has come to my knowledge that Bahādur Gīlānī, the governor of the port of Dabul had plundered twenty vessels belonging to my government and to merchants which were filled with valuables and pearls and various rich stuffs, and had sent two hundred ships to Mahim and had invaded and ravaged that country and had burnt down mosques and other places of worship. As I had and have regard for our old friendship it appears, under the orders of the judge of wisdom, that I should bring the circumstances to your knowledge. If the light of sovereignty (i.e.,

¹ The meaning is not at all clear. If Qiwām ul mulk was sent by Sultān Mahmūd Bahmanī, as the context would indicate, there would be no objection to his marching over a part of the Deccan, which was in the Bahmanī kingdom. In Frishtah's account, it appears that Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī wrote to Sultān Mahmūd Bahmanī complaining of the depredations committed by Bahādur Gīlānī, and pointed out, that the army of Gujrāt could not march to attack him by the land route, unless a part of the Dakhni kingdom was laid waste and trodden under foot (and ruined) by his soldiers. It would appear that Nizām ud-dīn has mixed up things a little. In fact, it appears from Frishtah that Kamāl Khān and Šafdar Khān came with a brave army by sea, under the orders of the Sultān of Gujrāt, and that Bahādur had fought with them and seized them and kept them in imprisonment. This is however, not mentioned in Col. Buggs's translation.

you your self) should not advance to crush him I would give him such punishment that it would be a warning to him. Mahmūd Shah gave assurances to the ambassador and summoned the *amirs* who were in agreement with him and told them that The return of the rights of benefits is incumbent on all and more specially on Sultans. Besides Sultān Mahmud Cujratī is a sovereign possessing much power and it is conceivable that injury may be caused by him to this country and as discourteous and wrongful acts have been committed by Bahadur Gilānī it is right and proper that the *amirs* should collect their armies and turn their attention to his discomfiture and destruction. Then according to the advice of the *amirs* a *farman* was sent to Bahadur and he was informed of the purport of Sultān Mahmud's letter. He was also directed to send to the court all that he had taken from the ships and to send the ships also by way of the sea and also to send Kamāl Khān and Safdar Khān and every one connected with them to his presence. He was also informed of the purport of these couplets

Couplets

Why dost not thou to thy own good attend ?
 Make not the face of thy fortune black
 Place not thy foot outside the measure right
 For thou wilt headlong fall into the well of danger dire

When Bahadur heard that a servant of Mahmud Shah was bringing the *farman* he wrote to his guards of the road that they should not let him pass beyond the fort of Mirich. He loosened his audacious tongue to give expression to boasting and bragging and wrote an improper reply and forwarded it. When (the news of) the temerity and audacity of Bahadur and of his preposterous reply reached Mahmud Shah ¹ he with the advice and concurrence

¹ Firishtah's account of the expedition agrees mainly with that in the text but he says in addition that Yusuf Ādil Khān sent five thousand horse men under his *Sar Naubat* (*Sar* or rather *Meer Naubat* according to Briggs p. 57 means Commander of the bodyguard) Kamāl Khān Dakinī and Malik Ahmad Nizam ul mulk Bahri the same number under Mubāriz Khān (Col Briggs calls him Moetibar Khan) son of Khwājah Jahān Turk and Fath ul lah Imad ul mulk also sent a small body of horsemen under one of his trusted servants to reinforce him. Bahādur Gilānī had had fights with the first two and

of the *amīns* advanced against him by successive marches and after traversing many stages arrived in front of the ¹ fort which Bahādur had been engaged for a long time in strengthening and in which he had collected an immense number of cavalry and infantry. The garrison on seeing the number and grandeur of the Sultān's army turned then ill-starred faces towards flight. The Sultān remained there for three days in order to arrange the affairs of the place, and then advanced towards ² Bōrkāl, where Bahādur had fortified himself. Before however the (royal) troops arrived there Bahādur abandoned the fort and fled. The Rāv or *zamīndār* of the place came to attend on the Sultān and enlisted himself among his loyal adherents. When Bahādur fled from Bōrkāl the commander of his army took up his position in the fort of Mirch. The *amīns* then decided on the capture of Mirch, and taking Mahmūd Shāh with them they advanced against it. When they arrived there (they found), that the governor of the neighbourhood had come to the help of Bahādur's men, and had strengthened the fort. They came forward to meet and fight with the invading army. The latter surrounded the fort from all sides and attacked Bahādur's men. When most of those who had sallied out of the fort with the desire of fighting were mixed with the dust of destruction and the

they had not been able to defeat him, and they therefore considered it fortunate that the Sultān should undertake his chastisement. When they arrived at the fort of Jāmkhāndī (which, it appears Bahādur had by his good policy, (جمن دستر) wrested from the possession of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān), Qutb ul-mulk Dakīnī, who was the *tarafdār* of Tilang, was ordered to attack it, but he was killed by an arrow shot from the fort. The Sultān conferred the title of Qutb-ul-mulk on Sultān Qulī Khawās Hamadānī with certain territories in Talingāna as his *jāgīr*. This man later became the founder of the Qutb Shāhī dynasty. When Jāmkhāndī was taken, it was made over to the servants of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān. The Sultān then marched towards Manklīr (in the lith. ed.—Mangalore (?), but Col. Briggs has Sunkeswar) where Bahādur had taken up his residence. Before, however, the Sultān's troops arrived there, Bahādur fled from that place. It was taken in the course of three days, after which the Sultān marched towards Mirch. The garrison came out and gave battle, but most of them were slain, and the survivors retired into the fort.

¹ The name of the fort is not given in the text, but probably Jāmkhāndī is referred to. See the preceding note.

² Bōrkāl does not appear to be mentioned by Frishtah.

governor of that country who was the head and leader of the rebel was killed the remainder fled and like snakes got into hole Mahmud Shah and the *amirs* considered it advisable that they should distribute the batteries (among the leaders of the army) and dig mines on various sides of the fort so that the water in the fort might flow into the moat and the garrison might be in great straits for want of water It was also decided that opposite to each bastion a bastion should be erected outside the fort

When the commandant of the fort saw that the path of flight was closed he came in great humility and prayed for quarter Mahmud Shah with the consent of the *amirs* gave him promise of protection and notified to the soldiers of Bahadur that to such of them as might wish to enter his service the men in charge of his treasury would give subsistence allowance and *jagirs* and as regards such of them as might wish to go to Bahadur the guards of the roads would not prevent them taking away with them their horses and equipment After his mind had been set at rest about the fort of Mirich the Sultan turned his attention towards the forts of Kalhar and Dabul When he arrived at the village or place called ¹Malwa a son was born to him on the 27th Rajab in the year 899 A.H. In gratitude for this great gift he opened his hand for giving benefactions and largesses and placing the crown of Ahmad Shah on the head of that light of his eyes gave him the name of Ahmad Shah

When Bahadur heard of the conquest of the fort of Mirich and of the advance of the Sultan towards Kalhar and Dabul he fell into the chasm of amazement and the gulf of bewilderment He knew that with meagre plannings he had attempted a great feat On whatever side he looked he found the door of flight closed Then in distress and humility he sent Khwajah Na amat ul lah Tabrizi to wait on the *amirs* and to ask for pardon of his offences Sultan

¹ The name is Mälwa in both MSS and in the lith ed In the lith ed of Firishtah the name cannot be made out the sentence being ارمرح كوحدده بياده رب where the word بياده appears to be a mistake for the name of the place but it will be seen from note p 1 Firishtah has Piada as the name for a place Col Briggs (vol II page 541) calls the place Walwa The birth of the son is mentioned in the lith ed of Firishtah but I cannot find any reference to it in Col Briggs's History

Mahmūd Shāh, in accordance with the prayers of the *amīrs* drew the pen of forgiveness across the offences of Bahādur Gilānī, and pardoned all his faults. He ordered that if Bahādur would hasten to render homage to him and would send two elephants and the tribute, which had been fixed to the treasury, the forts and towns, which have been taken out of his possession would again be restored to him. Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah wrote to Bahādur that his prayers had been accepted and he should come with all haste. When the Khwājah's letter reached Bahādur,¹ the crow of pride again laid the egg of conceit and exultation in his head. He cast down the honour which he would have acquired by his (forth-coming) engagements and promises into the dust of wretchedness. The *amīrs*, taking Mahmūd Shāh with them advanced in the direction of the fort of ²Jākīr. When they arrived on the bank of the river of Kalhar, they distributed the batteries (among themselves) and besieged the fort. When the morning raised the veil of darkness from the cheek of the sky, the whole army at once galloped into the battle-field, and whoever came out of the fort to give them battle became at once food for their swords. When the greatness and grandeur of Mahmūd Shāh's army were impressed on the minds of the enemy, and night came on they gave up all idea of fighting and took to flight, and owing to their evil destiny³ the town of Kalhar was sacked.

On hearing this news, Malik Shams-ud-dīn Tārmī *thānadār* of Mustafābād, came with the residents of that city to see the Sultān. The latter after waiting for two or three days in the town of Kalhar, and arranging the affairs of that territory, advanced towards ⁴Kālāpūr.

¹ This agrees generally with Firishtah, but he adds that Bahādur boasted that he would have the *Khutba* (public prayers) read in his own name, that same year, in Ahmadābād Bidai, and the next year in Ahmadābād Gujrāt. Col Briggs (vol II, page 541) says that Bahādur 'made an attack on the King's baggage', but I cannot find any mention of this in the lith ed of Firishtah.

² The name is جاکیر Jākīr in the MSS and جایگیر Jāy gīr in the lith ed. Firishtah does not mention the place, but says that the Sultān on hearing Bahādur's bragging, came from Pīyāda to Kalhar.

³ Firishtah also says the town was sacked, but Col Briggs does not mention the fact.

⁴ The town is called Kālāpūr in one MS and in the lith ed and Kālānūr in the other MS, but evidently both names are incorrect, the correct name is Kolāpūr, and is used later on.

When he arrived in the village of ¹Salala news was brought that Bahadur having come out of the fort of Panala had marched towards Kolapur and had with a mustal en idea got a body of men to join him and was preparing for strife and bloodshed. After receiving this news when (the Sultān) by successive marches arrived in the vicinity of Kolapur most of Bahadur's troops separated from him and joined the service of Mahmud Shah. Bahadur then fled and betook him self to a corner. Mahmud Shah with the advice of the *amirs* sent Malik ²Fakhr ul mulk and Ain ul mulk to take charge of the fort of Panala and its neighbourhood and decided that he would spend the rainy season in Kolapur till the bushes of the enmity and tree of the rebellion of Bahadur should be totally uprooted. When Bahadur received information of this his eye of hope became blind and he fell from the zenith of pride down to the nadir of humility. He then again sent a petition by the hand of Khwajah Na mat ul lah Tabrizi and prayed that an 'agreement

¹ Apparently not mentioned by Firihatah

It is according to Firihatah the strongest fort in that part of the country and Bahadur had taken shelter in it when he was frightened on hearing the news of the capture of the forts of Mirich and Kalhar. He now came out because the Sultān did not at once proceed to besiege it but went to view the sea and the port of Dābul. Firihatah says that when Mahmūd Shāh went to see the sea and the port of Dābul Bahādūr came rapidly to Kolapur with the intention of blocking the road and giving battle but when he saw the pomp and grandeur of Mahmūd Shāh's army he again became frightened and fled. Bahādūr's belief that the Sultān was too weak to engage him is apparently referred to by Nizām ud din by the use of the words *بنصر ناظر*.

² Firihatah calls him *میر الملک دکنی المتعاطب حاکم جہاں حاکم بریدہ* in the lith ed but Col Briggs calls him Khwajah Jahan governor of the fort of Purenda. Firishtah also joins *میر الملک دکنی* with Fakhr ul mulk and Ain ul mulk but Col Briggs does not mention either Ain ul mulk or Main Khān.

³ Firishtah says that the *qat' in ma* was to bear the sacred seal (مہر اقدس) of the Sultān and also the seals of Malik Qāsim Barid Turk and other chief men. It may be mentioned that throughout the narrative of the expedition against Bahādūr Gilān and in fact of the whole reign both in the accounts of Nizām ud din and Firishtah there are indications of Mahmud Shāh being a puppet in the hands of Qasim Barid and other nobles. There are attempts made to show that he had great power and grandeur but it appears also that he could do nothing without the concurrence of Qāsim Barid and his associates.

(*qaulnāma*) might be sent to him by the hand of the *vazīrs*, so that ¹ he might, with assurance of safety, come and attend on His Majesty, and for the remainder of his life never transgress the path of obedience. Mahmūd Shāh accepted the prayer in order to put down the flames of disturbance and sent the *qaulnāma*. Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah again represented that if ² Sharf-ul-'Ulamā Sadī Jahān and Qādī Zam-ud-dīn Hasan should also go with the ³ learned men it would be the cause of greater faith in the wild (وشی) Bahādur (The Sultān) ordered that these revered men should accompany the ⁴ *vazīrs*. When the *vazīrs* and noble men arrived near Bahādur (they found) a deep river (in front of them). First of all Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah and ⁵ Khwājah Majd-ud-dīn crossed the river, and described the graciousness of the Sultān, and the coming of the *vazīrs*.

Bahādur's resolution was again changed and his evil destiny did not permit that he should keep his feet of grace straight in the path of goodness. The two Khwājahs came back, and stated to the *vazīrs* how the matter stood. ⁶ Khadam Khān who had the reins of the affairs in his grasp of authority, and Quṭb-ul-mulk then crossed the river, and went to Bahādur and they did everything that was possible in the way of advice. Bahādur welcomed the arrival of the Khāns with all honour and respect, but as his mind had become darkened it did not at all become clear by the polishing of

¹ There are slight differences in the readings. One MS has اردوی اطمینان. The other has اردو اطمینان عازم ~ صور گردید. The lith ed has اردو اطمینان عازم ~ صور گردید. The first appears to me to be the best, and I have accepted it.

² He is called سراف العلماء in one MS and in the lith ed, but in the other MS he is called اسراف العمل or مشرف العمل. Firishtah calls him مشرف العمل.

³ Both MSS have علماء, but the lith ed has ورا.

⁴ The MSS have ورا و سرفا چون فریب بهادر رسدند. The lith ed has ورا و سرفا چون فریب بهادر رسدند.

⁵ According to Firishtah he had come with Khwājah Na'mat-ul-lah, bearing Bahādur's petitions.

⁶ This name is doubtful. It is خدمکان (apparently a mistake for خدم حان) in one MS, and خدمت حان in the other. It is خدم حان in the lith ed, and خدم حان in Firishtah.

their precepts. When they returned ¹Maḥdum Azam Sadr Jahān and Qadī Zaim ud dīn Hasan also went and did not refrain from giving him advice. But as he had fallen a hundred *farsakhs* away from the path of truth good fortune did not come to his aid and wishing only to waste time he said that if Mahmud Shāh should march towards the fort of Mirich this slave (that is he himself) would come there and render him homage.

²After the *amirs* had returned the Sultān summoned Malīk Fakhr ul mulk from the fort of Panala and having with the consent of the *amirs* conferred on him a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt ent him to effect the destruction of Bahadur. Malīk Fakhr ul mulk proceeded by successive marches and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of Bahadur he on the following day marched forward with his army arrayed for battle. Bahadur met him with great pride and self confidence and began to act with great gallantry. But suddenly an ³arrow discharged from the bow string of destiny struck him on the side and Zaim ḥān with the blood letting blade of his lance hurled him from the saddle to the ground and cut off his head which had been filled with so much pride and sent it to the Sultān. This victory was the result of the skilful work of Malīk Fakhr ul mulk and Zaim ḥān and it gave much pleasure and happiness to all

¹ He is called اعظم صدر جهان in one MS and in the lith ed. In the other MS he is called apparently by mistake only اعظم صدر جهان. He was called something else before see note page 124. Firishtah however calls him مصرف العمل in both places.

² Firishtah's account agrees generally but he says that Mahmud Shāh (ناچار) having no other alternative or being unable to induce Bahādur to submit sent for Malīk Fakhr ul mulk. He also says that Qutb ul mulk and others accompanied Fakhr ul mulk from Iānāla but Mahmud Shāh sent Qutb ul mulk back to go on with the siege of Panala for fear that Bahādur might advance in that direction and the trouble might be prolonged. Firishtah also says that Bahadur had two thousand horsemen most of whom were Gilanis and Mazandarāns and Iraqis and Ḥurasanis and fifteen thousand infantry and many cannon and muskets.

³ Firishtah says he died (در گذشت) on being struck by the arrow but somewhat inconsistently adds that Zaim ḥān brother of Fakhr ul mulk and according to another statement Main Ḥān cast him down from his saddle by striking him with his lance.

classes, high and low At the time of the return of Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk, the Sultān sent the *amīns* and the troops and all the retainers to welcome him, and ¹ conferred on him the title of *Khawājah Jahān*, and in the same *maḡlis*, a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt and an 'Arab horse and an elephant were bestowed on him and the horses and weapons which Bahādur had brought as tribute were conferred on Zam *Khān*

Two or three days after the victory (the Sultān) entered the fort of Panāla and sent ² Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk from there to the island (of Goa), so that he might take possession of it by transfer from Bahādur, and send all Bahādur's property and equipage, and bring Malik Sa'id his brother to the court, after giving him assurance of royal favour After some days 'Ain-ul-mulk came back, bringing Malik Sa'id with him He also passed before the eyes of the Sultān fifty elephants and three hundred 'Arab horses and much money and other things belonging to Bahādur As marks of loyalty were patent on the forehead of Malik Sa'id he received the title of Bahādur Malik in the same *maḡlis* (i.e., in the *maḡlis* in which he was presented before the Sultān) The properties and territories of Bahādur were, with the advice and concurrence of the *vazīrs*, entrusted to 'Ain-ul-mulk, and the Sultān returned towards the capital When he arrived in the town of Bijāpūr, he halted in a ³ garden house which had been built by *Khawājah Jahān Fakhr-ul-mulk*, and spent two or three days there in pleasure and enjoyment The *Khawājah* offered as tribute handsome and valuable things and 'Arab horses,

¹ Both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah had been giving him the title of *Khawājah Jahān* from a time anterior to this Firishtah does not say that the title of *Khawājah Jahān* was conferred on him after this victory, but the word *Makhdūm*, which appears to be an entirely Dakinī honorific, was added to his title

² He is called Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk Kan'ānī in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, Col Briggs (vol. II, page 543) calls him Mullik Ain-ul-Mulk Geelany He is said to have been sent to the port of Goa

³ Firishtah says the garden was called *Kālābāgh*, and it had been planted by Malik-ut-tujār Mahmūd Gāwān *Khawājah Jahān*, and not by Fakhr-ul-mulk *Khawājah Jahān*, as stated by Nizām-ud-dīn He also says that the Sultān visited it at the invitation of Yūsuf 'Ādil *Khān*, after sending the camp on to the capital, and the tribute was offered by Yūsuf 'Ādil *Khān*

more than can be contained in the desire of anybody and was exalted by the gift of a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt

On his arrival at the capital the Sultān on the advice of the *amirs* showed favour to the ambassadors of Sultan Mahmud Gujrātī and bestowed Arab horses on them. He also conferred on them double of what was the customary (remuneration) of ambassadors. He also made over to the *vakils*¹ five maunds of pearls of the weight of Delhi and five elephants and one jewelled dagger as presents (to Sultan Mahmud Gujrātī). He sent for Kamal Khan and Safdar Khan and all the adherents of Sultan Mahmud whom Bahadur had kept in imprisonment to his presence and granted favours and benefactions to them and gave them permission to go back to Gujrat. He also ordered that the twenty ships belonging to Sultan Mahmud which Bahadur had looted should be made over to the Sultān's servants so that the chain of inherited friendship and alliance might be strengthened.

It has been narrated before that in the early days of the Sultān's reign all freshness and beauty had departed from the trees

¹ Frishta also mentions these presents

² It appears from Frishta that the defeat and death of Bahādūr Gilāni and the events connected with them took place on or before 901 A.H. 1490 A.D. and Nizamuddin says that Sultan Mahmud died in 977 A.H. while Frishta says that he died in 984 A.H. Col Briggs has 944 A.H. 1518 A.D. so that there was a period of 3 or 6 years between the events. Nizamuddin passes over the account of what happened in the course of these years in about fifteen lines of the lithed Frishta gives a more detailed account. According to him Qutb ul mulk Hamadan who became the founder of the Qutb Shah dynasty was made *ta'afīr* of Warangal and got Hasanābād Gulbarga and Saglūr with their dependencies as his fief. At the same time the Sultan was informed that the *man abdars* were the cause of the strength of the great *amirs* and of the latter rising in rebellion and therefore except the *man abdars* all other *mansabdars* were taken away from Dastur Dīnār and were joined to the royal army. It may be mentioned in explanation that all commanders of less than five hundred were *man abdars* and those of five hundred and more were *amirs*. Dastur Dīnār was aggrieved at the *mansabdars* being taken away from him and raised the standard of revolt and took forcible possession of a part of Tlang which was contiguous to Gulbarga. The Sultan demanded help from Yūfī Ādil Khan and he came and joined the Sultan and Qasim Barid and they fought with Dastur Dīnār and Aziz ul mulk and all the Habshs and Dakins who had joined him near the town of Mahindri.

classes, high and low At the time of the return of Malik Fakhr-ul-mulk, the Sultān sent the *amīns* and the troops and all the retainers to welcome him, and ¹ conferred on him the title of Khwājah Jahān, and in the same *maḡlis*, a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt and an 'Arab horse and an elephant were bestowed on him, and the horses and weapons which Bahādur had brought as tribute were conferred on Zain Khān

Two or three days after the victory (the Sultān) entered the fort of Panāla and sent ² Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk from there to the island (of Goa), so that he might take possession of it by transfer from Bahādur, and send all Bahādur's property and equipage, and bring Malik Sa'id his brother to the court, after giving him assurance of royal favour After some days, 'Ain-ul-mulk came back, bringing Malik Sa'id with him He also passed before the eyes of the Sultān fifty elephants and three hundred 'Arab horses and much money and other things belonging to Bahādur As marks of loyalty were patent on the forehead of Malik Sa'id he received the title of Bahādur Malik in the same *maḡlis* (i.e., in the *maḡlis* in which he was presented before the Sultān) The properties and territories of Bahādur were, with the advice and concurrence of the *vazīrs*, entrusted to 'Ain-ul-mulk, and the Sultān returned towards the capital When he arrived in the town of Bijāpūr, he halted in a ³ garden house which had been built by Khwājah Jahān Fakhr-ul-mulk, and spent two or three days there in pleasure and enjoyment The Khwājah offered as tribute handsome and valuable things and 'Arab horses,

¹ Both Nizām ud-dīn and Firishtah had been giving him the title of Khwājah Jahān from a time anterior to this Firishtah does not say that the title of Khwājah Jahān was conferred on him after this victory, but the word Makhdūm, which appears to be an entirely Dakinī honorific, was added to his title

² He is called Malik 'Ain-ul-mulk Kan'ānī in the lith ed of Firishtah, Col Briggs (vol II, page 543) calls him Mullik Ein-i I-Mulk Geelany He is said to have been sent to the port of Goa

³ Firishtah says the garden was called Kālābāgh, and it had been planted by Malik-ut-tujjār Mahmūd Gāwān Khwājah Jahān, and not by Fakhr-ul-mulk Khwājah Jahān, as stated by Nizām-ud-dīn He also says that the Sultān visited it at the invitation of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān, after sending the camp on to the capital, and the tribute was offered by Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān

more than can be contained in the desire of anybody and was exalted by the gift of a special robe of honour and a jewelled belt

On his arrival at the capital the Sultān on the advice of the *amirs* showed favour to the ambassadors of Sultān Mahmud Gujrātī and bestowed Arab horses on them. He also conferred on them double of what was the customary (remuneration) of ambassadors. He also made over to the *taliks*¹ five maunds of pearls of the weight of Delhi and five elephants and one jewelled dagger as presents (to Sultān Mahmud Gujrātī). He sent for Kamal Khan and Sūfīdar Khan and all the adherents of Sultān Mahmud whom Bahadur had kept in imprisonment to his presence and granted favours and benefactions to them and gave them permission to go back to Gujrāt. He also ordered that the twenty ships belonging to Sultān Mahmud which Bahadur had looted should be made over to the Sultān's servants so that the chain of inherited friendship and alliance might be strengthened.

It has been narrated before that in the early days of the Sultān's reign all freshness and beauty had departed from the trees

¹ Firishtah also mentions these presents

² It appears from Firishtah that the defeat and death of Bahadur Gilāni and the events connected with them took place on or before 901 A H 1495 A D and Nizam ud din says that Sultan Mahmud died in 974 A H while Firishtah says that he died in 984 A H. Col Briggs has 944 A H 1518 A D so that there was a period of 3 or 6 years between these events. Nizam ud din passes over the account of what happened in the course of these years in about fifteen lines of the lithed Firishtah gives a more detailed account. According to him Qutb ul mulk Hamad ni who became the founder of the Qutb Shahi dynasty was made *tarafdar* of Warangal and got Hasanabad Gulbarga and Sa₁ir with the dependencies as his fief. At the same time the Sultan was informed that the *mansabdars* were the cause of the strength of the great *amirs* and of the latter rising in rebellion and therefore except the *mansabdars* all other *mansabdars* were taken away from Dastur Dinār and were joined to the royal army. It may be mentioned in explanation that all commanders of less than five hundred were *mansabdars* and those of five hundred and more were *amirs*. Dastur Dinār was aggrieved at the *mansabdars* being taken away from him and raised the standard of revolt and took forcible possession of a part of Tlāng which was contiguous to Gulbarga. The Sultān demanded help from Yusuf Adil Khan and he came and joined the Sultan and Qasim Bahadur and they fought with Dastur Dinār and Aziz ul mulk and all the Habshis and Dakinis who had joined him near the town of Mahindri

of the garden of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, owing to the assassination of Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, and the flight of Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Imād-ul-

(Col. Briggs calls the place Myndungy, and says, in a note, that it is situated near Akulkote) and Dastūr Dīnār was defeated, chiefly by the manly exertions of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān. He was taken prisoner and was ordered by the Sultan to be put to death, but he was not only pardoned, but restored in his government, at the intercession of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān. Some of the rebels took shelter in the fort of Saghīr, but it was seized and made over to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān.

In 902 A.H. Yūsuf Ghulam Dalīmī and Faghrih Khān Dalīmī and Mīrzā Shams ud dīn (the first two are called Yooseof Deccany and Yoorish Khan by Col. Briggs) entered into a conspiracy to destroy Qāsim Barīd, but the latter coming to know of it put them all to death. The Sultan also helped to extinguish the flames of slaughter and pillage, but he was so angry with Qāsim Barīd and the other Turks, that he would not, for one month, take their *salāms*, and at last, at the intercession of Shāh Muhibb ul lah, he was induced with great reluctance to pardon them. After this the Sultan sank again into drunkenness and debauchery, so that his greatness and grandeur completely passed away from the minds of the people.

In 903 A.H. Mahmūd Shāh asked the daughter of Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān Bibi Satī, by name, who was one year old for his son Ahmad who was four years of age. This was child marriage *in excelsis*. Col. Briggs does not give the age of the bride, but calls her 'the infant daughter of Yooseof Adil Khan'. The age of the bridegroom, he says, was fourteen years. The marriage, it was arranged, would take place at Hasanābād Gulbarga, and it was arranged that when the bride would attain the age of ten years she should be sent to the Shāhzada. While the marriage festivities were still in progress, Dastūr Dīnār and Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān had a dispute about the fief of Gulbarga, the former arguing that Bijāpur up to the bank of the Bithura (Bīmū) should belong to Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān, and Gulbarga and Annatgū as far as the boundary of Tilang should belong to him (Col. Briggs has Koolbarga, Sagur and Etgeer), and the latter that Hasanābād, Gulbarga, Aland, Ganjautī and Kalhān should belong to him, so that his territory should abut on that of the Sultan. A battle was fought between the two contestants, and then partisans, in the neighbourhood of Ganjautī Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān was victorious, and became very powerful, so that even the Sultan could not sit on the throne in his presence. Then the nobles retired to their fiefs, and Qāsim Barīd returned, and became *raḥīl* as before, and now his power became so great that the Sultan without his permission could not get even a drink of water when he was thirsty.

In 904 A.H., Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān led an army against Dastūr Dīnār, and the latter fled from Hasanābād Gulbarga, and at the suggestion of Qāsim Barīd went to Malik Ahmad Nizām ul-mulk, who rendered him much help. Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān being unable to withstand them hastened to Ahmadābād Bidar. The Sultan wrote to Malik Ahmad Nizām ul-mulk and directed him not to assist

mulk and the hearts of the *amirs* had become estranged from him. At this time when he returned from camp and took up his residence

Dastūr Dīnār Malik Ahmad Nizām ul mulk complied with this but prayed that the Sultān would direct Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān not to molest Dastūr Dīnār. Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān at a hint from the Sultān forbore from causing further molestation to Dastūr Dīnār.

In 910 A H Qāsim Barid died and his son Amīr Barid displaced the Sultān of the little power which he still possessed. In the same year Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān fought a battle with Dastūr Dīnār and defeated him and put him to death. He then took possession of all his fief and had the *Khubba* read in his own name according to the tenets of the *Shi'a* faith in Bijpur. This made him very unpopular with all the people of the Dakin and Mal mūd Shāh wrote letters through Amīr Barid to Malik Qutb ul mulk Hamadānī and Fath ul lah Imād ul mulk and Khudānāl Iḥān Habsht about Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān's rebellion and his acceptance of the tenets of the *Jirāfī* (Shi'a) and asked them to come immediately to help to destroy Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān. Qutb ul mulk Hamadānī came with all the *amirs* of Tilang but the others sent excuses. The Sultān and Amīr Barid wrote in some anxiety to Ahmad Nizām ul mulk Baharī and asked for his help. He and Malik Fakīr ul mulk Dakinī Khwajah Jahān came very quickly with a large army. Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān did not think it advisable to meet them. He made Sighur Hasanābād and Aland over to Darāz Iḥān and Fakīr ul mulk Turk and sent his infant son Ismā'il with Ismā'il Iḥān and other trustworthy noble with elephants and treasures to Bijāpūr so that they might govern the country from that fort. He himself with five thousand horsemen started for Berār. The Sultān and Amīr Barid with those who had come to their assistance pursued him till Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān reached Kāwāl where Fath ul lah Imād ul mulk was encamped. The latter said that it would not be advisable to fight with the Sultān and advised Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān to go for a time to Burhānpur till he could arrange matters. Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān accepted this advice and went to Burhānpur. Then Fath ul lah Imād ul mulk wrote to Ahmād Nizām ul mulk Baharī etc. that Amīr Barid wanted to destroy Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān and if he succeeded in doing this he having the Sultān with him would become very powerful and would crush them all. They should therefore go away to their own territories. They accepted this advice and started. The next day Fath ul lah Imād ul mulk submitted a representation to the Sultān and advised him to pardon Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān and to go back to the capital. The Sultān at the instigation of Amīr Barid did not accept this advice but wanted to march with Amīr Barid to Bijāpur. Yūsuf Ādil Iḥān hearing all that had happened came with lightning speed and joined Fath ul lah Imād ul mulk. They then marched against the Sultān's camp. Amīr Barid seeing that he could not be able to withstand them returned with the Sultān to Ahmadābād Bidar.

in Bidar, and the *sardārs* went to their respective places, even the little power and the small grandeur which had been left parcelled away

In 912 A.H., Yūsuf ‘Ādil Khān and Iʿūd ul mulk Imād ul mulk and Fakhr ul mulk Dakinī Khwājah Jahān died and their sons succeeded them. Amīr Barīd tried to seize Bijāpūr but all his efforts were unsuccessful.

In 918 A.H., Qutb ul mulk Hamadām declared his independence and removed the name of the Sultān from the *Khutba* but he sent fifty thousand *hūns* every month to the Sultān.

In 920 A.H. Amīr Barīd raised a large army with the royal treasure and taking the Sultān with him, marched to Gulbarga and took it from the possession of Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān, and made it over to the adopted son of Dastūr Dīnārī, who had the name of Juhāngir Khān and whom he gave the title of Dastūr ul mulk. The latter collected an army and recovered all the fort on his side of the Pithōra (or the Bana river) from Sachin to Naldung which had been in the possession of his father. Amīr Barīd then crossed the river with reinforcements from Malik Ahmad Nizam ul mulk Baharī and Qutb ul mulk, and marched to Bijāpūr. Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān gave him battle near Bijāpūr, and completely defeated him, so that he fled from the battlefield. The Sultān fell from his horse, and remained helpless on the battlefield with his son, Ahmad Khān. Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān, however, treated him with great respect and wanted to take him to Bijāpūr, but he remained in the town of Mand where he was treated for his wounds. After a short time he went with Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān to Hasanūbūd Gulbarga, the latter made over his sister, who had already been betrothed to him, to Shāh-zāda Ahmad Khān. The Sultān then marched with three or four thousand Mughal horsemen whom he obtained from Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān, to Ahmadūbūd Bidar. Amīr Barīd evacuated the capital, and retired to the fort of Ūrisa (Col. Briggs has Ousa). But soon after that, the officers of Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān heard that Amīr Barīd had combined with Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk Baharī, and was advancing with a great army, and they returned to Bijāpūr in all haste. Amīr Barīd then came back to the capital and treated the Sultān with even greater strictness and harshness than before on account of his alliance with Ismāʿil ‘Ādil Khān. The Sultān being unable to bear this treatment fled to ‘Alā-ud dīn ‘Imād ul mulk at Kāwīl (Col. Briggs says he went to Gavul in Berar). ‘Alā-ud dīn ‘Imād ul mulk received him with respect, and marched with him to crush Amīr Barīd. The latter took shelter in the fort, and sent men to Burhān Nizām ul mulk, who sent Khwājah Jahān to assist him. Amīr Barīd then sallied out to give battle, and ‘Alā-ud dīn ‘Imād-ul-mulk met him, but the Sultān was bathing at the time. ‘Alā-ud dīn ‘Imād ul mulk sent one of his principal men to summon the Sultān, and the latter told the Sultān that a man who engages himself in bathing at such a time becomes a subject of ridicule to his people. The Sultān became very angry at this rebuke, and galloped off to Amīr Barīd’s army. ‘Alā-ud dīn ‘Imād-ul-mulk then retired to his own country, and Amīr Barīd re-entered the capital.

Malik Barid became so powerful that he left no one before (پس) him (i.e. probably to attend on him) and having strengthened the entrances and exits did not permit that he should come out of his harem. He took the management of affairs into his own hand and left Mahmud Shah nothing but the name of Sultan. Mahmud Shah wrote something about this to Imad ul mulk. The latter sent a reply to the effect that if His Majesty would come to Kawil this slave (i.e. he himself) would perform the duties of service and would give a fresh splendour and currency to the affairs of the *saltanat*. Mahmud Shah then with such pretexts as he could think of fled to Kawil. Malik Imad ul mulk welcomed his arrival with respect and honour and advanced with a large following to crush ¹Malik Barid. ²When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city of Bidar Malik Barid having equipped his army came forward to meet him. At the time when the armies were facing each other the slave who was the head of Imad ul mulk's tribesmen sent a message to the Sultan that His Majesty should now mount as the time of the battle had come. It so happened that at that time Mahmud Shah was engaged in washing his head. Imad ul mulk's slave said that when the Sultan was so negligent at the time of the battle there was no doubt that it was a sign of misfortune

with the Sultan and placed the latter in such strict confinement that it was impossible for him again to attempt to escape. Firishtah is rather inconsistent in describing the last days of Mahmud Shah. He says first that he نه در میان مردها نه در میان زندها - i.e. he was not counted among the dead or among the living but later on he says that he and his son who were both weak in intellect and indolent were contented with سراب و ساهد و سانی و بختگاه و قصر - i.e. with wine and mistresses and cup bearers and their throne and palace.

Firishtah places the death of Mahmud Shah on the 4th *Dhu'l Hijjah* 94 A.H. (Col Briggs has 98 A.H. October -1 1518) and says that he reigned for 37 years and 90 days.

This is a very long note but I have thought it necessary to give some account of the last years of the reign.

¹ Both the MSS have ملک برید. The lith. ed. has برید without any prefix. It appears however from Firishtah that Malik Qasim Barid died in 910 A.H. and was succeeded by his son Amir Barid.

This is mentioned by Firishtah among the incidents of the year 90

Couplet

Whoe'er doth ignorance and indolence adopt,
His foot from the ground will fall, and his work from his
hand

These words appeared to be insolent to the Sultān. He then mounted his horse and rode over to the army of Malīk Barīd, and made a complaint about the slave of 'Imād-ul-mulk. 'Imād-ul-mulk seeing what had happened returned to Kāwil. After this, life became so miserable to the Sultān, that the maid-servants of Malīk Barīd carried his water and food to him, till in the year 927 A H, he departed from this difficult lower world. The period of his reign was forty years and two months and three days.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF AHMAD SHĀH,
SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

¹ In the year 927 A H, Malīk Barīd placed Sultān Ahmad Shāh, son of Mahmūd Shāh, on the throne, in the city of Bīdar, with the concurrence and advice of the *amīrs* and *khāns*, but he left only the name of *bādshāh* to him, and kept him (confined) in his house. The *amīrs* all took up their residences in their *jāgīrs*, and were all independent of one another. The name of *bādshāh* was given to

¹ Firishtah says that Amīr Barīd placed Ahmad Shāh on the throne, because he had only a small territory and only three or four thousand horse-men, and he was afraid that otherwise the rulers of the neighbouring countries would be tempted to seize Ahmadābād Bidar. He also says that the Sultān, like his father, was satisfied with sensual pleasures. As the stipend given to him by Amīr Barīd did not suffice for his expenses, he broke up the jewelled crown of the Bahmanīs, which was valued at four hundred thousand *hūns* (Col Briggs says in a note £1,60,000), and sold the gems secretly. When Amīr Barīd became aware of this, he put many musicians and others, who were in the palace, to death, and tried to get back the jewels, but was unsuccessful, as the men who had bought them, had fled to Bījānagar and other places.

The Sultān sent men secretly to Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān, and complained of the hardships he suffered at the hands of Amīr Barīd. Ismā'il 'Ādil Khān sent an ambassador with presents, and sent some verbal messages, but the Sultān died before the ambassador could arrive.

Firishtah says that Ahmad Shāh died in 927 A H, after a reign of two years and one month. Col Briggs (vol II, page 554) has the same year, but he reduces the duration of the reign to two years only.

poor oppressed Ahmad Shah for a period of two years and one month
He died in the year 929 A H

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTAN ALĀ UD DĪN¹ SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

When the poor and helpless Ahmad Shah died Malik Barid with the concurrence of the *amirs* took Ala ud din the brother of Ahmad Shah by the hand and made him the *badshah*. He kept him (confined) in the house as he had kept his brother. The nobility of the nature and the high spirit of the prince however incited him to collect men round him and to give fresh life to the ancient customs and rules and like his great ancestors to conquer fresh territory. Malik Barid coming to know of this in concert with Nizam ul mulk son of Malik Nizām ul mulk and Imad ul mulk son of Imad ul mulk and Ādil Khan son of Ādil Khan Sawai took away the name of *saltanat* from him. He in truth released him from bondage and confinement and raised his brother in his place. The period of his reign which was passed in confinement and imprisonment was one year and eleven months.

¹ He is called the son of Mahmud Shāh in the MSS. as well as in the lith ed. In the heading in the lith ed. of *Firishtah* he is described as the son of Ahmad Shah Bahmani. There is nothing said about his parentage in the account of his reign. In Col Briggs's translation there is no mention of King Alla ood Deen's father. It appears however that Mahmud had three sons Ahmad Shah, Ala ud din and Walf ul lah and they were raised to the throne one after the other but none of them had any real power.

According to *Firishtah* Amir Barid kept the throne unoccupied for fourteen days but after that for the same reason as before he did not himself mount it but placed Ala ud din on it. The latter who was brave and intelligent and knew that his predecessors had ruined themselves by indulgence in wine and sensual pleasures abstained from them and exerted himself to effect the destruction of Amir Barid and the others who had seized his ancestral dominion. With this object he flattered and conciliated Amir Barid. At the same time he collected a body of men for the assassination of Amir Barid and kept them concealed in the palace. They were to seize Amir Barid and his associates when they came to offer their salutations on the morning of the first day of the month. When they came near the Sultan's apartment one of the men who was hiding happened to sneeze. The plot was discovered. The conspirators were tortured and put to death and the Sultan was imprisoned and soon after put to death. His reign extended to two years and three months.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN WALĪ-UL-LAH,
SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

When¹ Malik Barid son of Barid, gave Sultān 'Alā'ud-dīn freedom from the imprisonment of sovereignty, he brought his brother, who had the name of Walī-ul-lah and appended the name of Sultān to him. He however without hesitation entered the Sultān's harem, and no one had the power to forbid him. Going there he conceived a passion for the Sultān's wife, and his evil passion led him to administer poison to Walī-ul-lah, and to take the latter's wife to himself. The period of his (i.e., Walī-ul-lah's)² imprisonment did not reach a year.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF³ KALĪM-UL-LAH
SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

After Sultān Walī-ul-lah had drunk the *sharbat* of martyrdom from the hand of⁴ Malik Barid, and after this nefarious deed had been perpetrated, the helpless Kalīm-ul-lah was made Sultān, and he was kept under guard like his brother in the city of Bidar.

¹ Both MSS leave out the word *Malik* before the second Barid. Of course the father was Qāsim Barid, and the son Amīr Barid.

² According to Firishtah Walī-ul-lah reigned as a puppet in Amīr Barid's hand for three years. He also like his brother tried to secure freedom. After this, Amīr Barid confined him in his harem. The latter then conceived a passion for the Sultān's wife, and effected his death, and then took his wife to himself.

³ Firishtah also in the heading of his account of Sultān Kalīm-ul-lah's reign calls the latter the son of Sultān Mahmūd Bahmanī, but at the end of his account of the reign of Sultān Walī-ul-lah, calls Sultān Kalīm-ul-lah daughter's son of Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh. This is incorrect, because it was Ahmad Shāh the eldest son of Mahmūd Shāh, and not Mahmūd Shāh himself, who married the daughter of Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh. Col Briggs makes the same mistake at the commencement of the account of Kulle'm Oolla Shah Bahmuny where he describes the latter as "The son of Ahmud Shah by the daughter of Yoosoof Adil Shah." It will be seen from the account of the events of the year 903 A H in footnote, page 128, and also from Col Briggs's History (vol II, page 558) that it was Ahmud Shah who was married to the daughter of Yoosoof Adil Shah.

⁴ Both MSS have ار دست ملک برید, without any reference to Malik Barid's parentage, but the lith ed has ار دست ملک برید بن برید.

¹ When the curtain of agreement was raised from the face of the affairs of the *amirs* Imad ul mulk Kawili went to the aid of Muhammad Khan son of Adil Khan the ruler of Ahr and Burhanpur and after fighting with Nizam ul mulk and Malik Barid and Khudawan Khan and all the *amirs* of the Deccan ran away. Three hundred elephants and a hundred horses and a large quantity of arms fell into the hand of the Dalwai armies. Imad ul mulk fled to Ahr and Burhanpur. But in the end with the help of Sultan Bahadur (of Gujarat) he regained possession of his dominions. In the year 93 A.H. he read the *Khutba* in the name of Sultan Bahadur in the towns and *paraganas* of his territories. Again at the invitation of Imad ul mulk Sultan Bahadur invaded the Deccan. As Nizam ul mulk and Malik Barid and the other *amirs* were not strong enough to withstand him they in their helplessness read the *Khutba* in the name of Sultan Bahadur in Ahmadnagar and all the provinces of the Deccan. The province of the Deccan then came into the possession of four *amirs* viz. Nizam ul mulk, Adil Khan, Qutb ul mulk and

² Firishtah does not mention these conflicts among the *amirs* at all. His account of the reign of Sultan Kalim ul lah is entirely different from that of Nizam ul lah. He states that in 93 A.H. Hārīr came from Kābul and took possession of Dillī. In Kābil All Shāh Barīd Nizam Shāh Barīd and Qutb Shāh all sent petitions to him expressing their attachment to him. Sultan Kalim ul lah on learning this also sent an ambassador to Hārīr offering him the territory of Barār and Daulatabād to him if he would free him from the prison in which he was kept. Hārīr was too busy elsewhere and could not pay any heed to this petition. When the news of this having sent the petition became known to Sultan Jām ul lah he sent an ambassador for him and visited him in 934 A.H. to enquire of him. All Shāh who at that place is described as his *ḥal* (maternal uncle) at Bijāpur. The latter according to the lithed attempt to seize him. (C. I. Briggs however says that he was received honourably.) He then escaped with eighteen horsemen to Burhān Nizam Shāh Bahadur at Ahmadnagar. Burhān Nizam Shāh received and treated him with royal honours till Shāh Tahir (in whom he the merey of C. I.) forbade him to do so and explained that such conduct was highly impolitic for him. After that Burhān Nizam Shāh discontinued receiving Sultan Kalim ul lah who after that died at Ahmadnagar either by poison being given to him or by a natural death.

³ Firishtah mentions five dynasties in total of Nizam ud din's four viz. Adil Shāhī, Nizam Shāhī, Qutb Shāhī, Imād Shāhī and Barid Shāhī. Mr. Sewell (page 100) also mentions five dynasties viz. the Adil Shāhs of Bijāpur, the Barid Shāhs of Bidr or Ahmadabad; the Imād Shāhs of Bidr, the Nizam Shāhs of Ahmadnagar and the Qutb Shāhs of Golkonda.

Malik Barīd, and up to this day which is in the year 1002 A H, the rule of the Deccan is vested in these four dynasties. And something of their conditions will now be narrated.

SECTION II ¹THE NIZĀM-UL-MULKĪ LINE OR DYNASTY.

AN ACCOUNT OF NIZĀM-UL-MULK BAHRĪ

He was a slave of Brahman descent. His name had been ²بهریو (Bhareu) and by change of letters, he was called Bahrī. ³His son Ahmad, who had in his head an ambition to rule, commenced hostilities, the *vazīrs* of Sultān Kalīm-ul-lah made Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī a prisoner, and drawing a pencil across his eyes, ultī-

¹ Firishtah begins with an account of the 'Ādil Shāhī line, and then goes on with the Nizām Shāhīs. The title of the section is not given in the text edition.

² Bhareu may be a corruption of Bhairo, which again is a corruption of Sanskrit Bhanava (lit. terrible) one of the names of the god Śiva. Firishtah (lith. ed.) says that Malik Nāvib Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī's name was تیمابھت Timābhat and his father's name was بهریو Bhareu. Col Briggs (vol. III, p. 189) says his name was Timapa, son of Bhairoo. It is not clear to me why he was called Bhareu or Bahrī which was his father's name, and not Timābhat which was his own name. According to Firishtah, Timābhat and Bhareu were taken prisoners by the Musalmāns in Bijānagar in the reign of Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, and Bhareu's name was changed to Hasan when he was enlisted among the Sultān's slaves or guards. He was very intelligent, and so was sent to school with the prince who later became Muhammad Shāh. In a short time he became well known as Malik Hasan Bhareu, but Muhammad Shāh in his boyhood being unable to pronounce Bhareu changed it to Bahrī, and he became known as Malik Hasan Bahrī. When Muhammad became the Sultān, he made Malik Hasan Bahrī a commander of one thousand horse, and the latter gradually rose to be Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī, and by the favour of Khwājah Jahān Gāwān was made *tarafdār* of Tīlang. In the text-edition it is بهرلو.

³ This is a very brief and incomplete and confused account. Firishtah's account of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty begins with the reign of Ahmad Nizām Shāh. The murder of Nizām-ul-mulk is only incidentally mentioned in it, where it is said that when Ahmad Nizām Shāh, after capturing a number of forts such as Jaund and Lahagar and Tangī, etc., was engaged in the siege of the fort of Dandī Rājpurī, that he heard of the murder of his father. As this happened before 895 A H, it could not have been the act of the *vazīrs* of Sultān Kalīm-ul-lah, as stated erroneously in the text, but must have occurred in the reign of Mahmūd Shāh which extended from 887 A H to 924, 927 or 928 A H, according to different accounts.

mately put him to death His rule had no stability and has been narrated in the history of the Bahmanis

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF AHMAD SON OF NIZAM UL MULK BAHRI

-After the death of his father Nizam ul mulk he declared his independence and having taken possession of the whole of the country of Junir he laid the foundation of a grand city in the middle of it and called it Ahmadnagar He died after having ruled for forty years As no comprehensive work containing particulars of the conditions of this dynasty has come before my eyes I am confining myself to this much

² AN ACCOUNT OF BURHAN NIZAM UL MULK SON OF AHMAD

When Burhān sat in his father's place ⁴ Shah Tahir who was one of the wisest men of the age came from Sulṭāniya in Irāq to the

¹ Nizam ud din very frankly acknowledges that he did not come across any comprehensive history of the Nizām Shahi dynasty and he has therefore made a very brief statement about Ahmad Nizam ul mulk The latter however ruled for forty years and an account of his reign extends over about ten pages of the lith ed of Firishtah and about twenty one pages of Col Briggs's translation It would be impossible for me to add much to Nizam ud din's account without unduly increasing the volume of this work I may say however that Ahmad Nizam ul mulk died in 914 A H 1518 A D leaving his son Burhan a boy seven years of age as his successor

² The words *مدار قرب نظام الملک بدر حدود* are in one MS only but not in the other or in the lith ed I have however inserted them in the text

³ Nizam ud din's account of the reign of Burhan Nizām ul mulk or Burhan Nizam Shāh as Firishtah calls him is very brief and incomplete The reign extended according to Nizam ud din to forty eight years and yet his narrative is confined to about nine lines of the lith ed Firishtah's account extends over eighteen pages of the lith ed and Col Briggs's translation to about twenty five pages It is impossible for me to give even a brief summary of the events which occurred during this long period I have however given a fairly comprehensive translation of the narrative in the lith ed of Firishtah (in the next note) of the conversion of Burhan Shāh and most of his subjects to the Shi'a form of the religion which appears to have taken place in 914 A H 1539 A D as this is mentioned in the Tabaqat The translation in Col Briggs vol III page ~ 8 is rather short and does not mention many very curious and interesting particulars

⁴ Firishtah begins with a long and detailed account of the previous history of Shah Tahir According to that Shah Tahir established himself in 906 A H

Deccan , and became a companion and courtier of Burhān , and making him adopt the *Imāmī* religion became his guide in religious matters

at Sultāniya as a religious teacher. Shāh Ismā'il Ṣafvī, however, ordered him to be put to death. He then left Sultāniya in all haste , and arrived at the port of Goa. From there, he went to Ismā'il 'Adil Shāh at Bijāpūr, but that ruler had no use for anyone except swordsmen and warriors , and so he did not show him any favour. Shāh Tāhir then started for the port of Chaul, in order to go on a pilgrimage to Mecca and Madīna. On the way he halted at the fort of Parinda, where Maḥdūm Khwājah Jahān Dakinī received him with great honour and respect. It so happened that at this time Burhān Nizām Shāh had sent his teacher Maulāna Pī Muhammad Shīrwānī, on an embassy to Khwājah Jahān and he remained there for about a year as a pupil of Shāh Tāhir. By this time the fame of Shāh Tāhir's learning had spread all over the Deccan , and when Pī Muhammad came back to Ahmadnagar, and explained the reason of his long stay at Parinda, and dilated on Shāh Tāhir's learning and wisdom Burhān Nizām-ul mulk, who was fond of the society of learned men, invited Shāh Tāhir to come to Ahmadnagar. He came, and was received with great honour, and began to give lessons to the learned men of the capital. Soon after this Shāhzāda 'Abd-ul qādir, eldest son of Burhān Nizām ul mulk fell ill, and all the physicians were unable to effect his cure. Then Shāh Tāhir suggested that he would be able to cure the prince, if Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk would make offerings to the twelve Imāms. Burhān agreed to do so, but Shāh Tāhir said that he did not suggest the making of offerings alone. He had something else in his mind, but he would disclose it only if Burhān would promise, that in the event of his suggestion not meeting with Burhān's approval, he would allow him and his sons to depart to Mecca. Burhān at once agreed, and bound himself by solemn oaths. Then Shāh Tāhir inquired that if the prince was cured that night, would Burhān agree to read the *Khutba* in the name of the twelve Imāms, and endeavour to give currency to the Shī'a form of religion. Burhān agreed. That night Burhān sat by the side of the bed of 'Abd ul qādir , and fell asleep, placing his head on the edge of the bed. Then he saw Muhammad and the twelve Imāms in a dream , and the next morning 'Abd-ul-qādir was cured. After that 'Abd ul qādir and his mother, Āmīna Bibī, and all the members of the royal family accepted the Shī'a faith. Burhān wanted that the names of the twelve Imāms should be inserted at once in the *Khutba* , but Shāh Tāhir suggested that it would be better if he should convene an assembly, when the merits of the four religious sects of Islām could be discussed. The discussion continued for six months without much effect. Burhān Shāh spoke to Shāh Tāhir , and said, he was unable to ascertain the superiority of any of the religious sects discussed. After further discussions, Burhān Shāh described his dream at the time of prince 'Abd ul qādir's illness. Then most of the members of the royal family and the great officers, etc , accepted the Shī'a

In the year 945 A.H. Sultān Bahadur Cujratī advanced to conquer the Deccan and having arrived in the neighbourhood of Ahmadnagar encamped at a place which is known as Kalachabutra. Burhan came forward in the way of sincerity and service and did homage to him. The latter showed him favour and gave him an umbrella and other insignia of royalty. They say that Sultān Bahadur said to Shah Tahir, "Do not you accompany Burhan when he comes to me so that there may be no derogation to your honour for whenever Burhan comes to wait on me he has to remain standing and as you are connected with him you have also to follow his example and remain standing." Sultān Bahadur held Shah Tahir in great respect.

As Burhan Nizam ul mulk received strength and support from Sultān Bahadur he had the public prayer read and coins struck in his own name. He ruled for forty eight years.

form of religion. Mullā Pir Muhammad and other learned men were angry and left the assembly. They then had a conference at Mullā Pir Muhammad's house where some one suggested that Shāh Tahir should be seized and put to death but Mullā Pir Muhammad said that as long as Burhan Shah should be alive they would not be able to effect their purpose. He suggested that Burhān Shāh should be deposed and prince 'Alī ul qādir placed on the throne after which Shāh Tahir could be executed. Then they surrounded the fort in which the palace was located. Burhan Shāh took measures for defending it but at the same time went to Shāh Tahir and explained the state of things. Shāh Tahir who was versed in divination told Burhān Shah to march out of the fort when the rebels would at once submit. Burhān Shāh did so. Then Shah Tahir read a verse of the Quran over a handful of earth and threw it in the direction of the enemy and told the heralds to go close to the latter and call out that all loyal subjects should immediately come under the shadow of the royal umbrella and those who were disloyal (*harā'ikhuar*) should follow Mullā Pir Muhammad. Immediately the *amirs* and the commanders of the army and the soldiers came over to Burhan Shāh while Mullā Pir Muhammad with a small number of soldiers went to his own house. He was seized by men who were sent by Burhan Shah and the latter ordered his execution but at the intercession of Shah Tahir the order of execution was cancelled and he was kept in imprisonment in a fort for four years after which again at the intercession of Shah Tahir he was restored to favour.

This is a long note but I have inserted it as it is very interesting in many ways. Col Briggs has left the matter of the conversion of Burhān Shah and his subjects entirely out of his translation.

AN ACCOUNT OF HUSAIN NIZĀM-UL-MULK, SON OF BURHĀN

After his father ¹ he sat in the latter's place. It is related traditionally that Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk became enamoured of a ² prostitute, and married her. One day he asked her in private, what persons she had liked best and pleased most, among the men who had visited her during the time that she had lived in her former way. She named four persons. He had all four of them seized, and gave orders for those helpless persons being put to death. That prostitute was called Āmina and Husain Nizām-ul-mulk was born of her.

¹ According to Firishtah the succession was not without a contest. Husain Shāh, who was thirty years of age (Col Briggs says incorrectly that he was in his thirteenth year), succeeded Burhān Nizām Shāh as being his eldest son, but Shāhzāda 'Abd-ul-qādir, who had much honour in the sight of his father, did not agree to Husain Shāh's succession. He and the other princes left the palace and two factions were formed: the foreigners and the Habshīs joined Husain Nizām Shāh, and the Dakinīs, Hindūs and Musalmāns were on the side of the other princes. There was every likelihood of a civil war, but Qāsim Beg Hakīm succeeded in detaching four hundred or five hundred *slahdārs* and *hawāladārs* from 'Abd-ul-qādir's party. Others joined Husain Nizām Shāh, and 'Abd-ul-qādir with some of his partisans fled to 'Imād-ul-mulk in Berāi. He died there. The other princes fled to Bijāpūr, and 'Ādil Shāh espousing the cause of one of them, Shāh Haidar, who was the son-in-law of Khwājah Jahān ruler of Parinda marched to recover Sholāpūr, but Husain Nizām Shāh attacked and captured the fort of Parinda.

Afterwards 'Ādil Shāh espoused the cause of Mirān Shāh 'Alī who was his cousin (*ammzāda*), but Husain Nizām Shāh advanced with seven thousand horsemen, whom he obtained from Daiyā 'Imād-ul-mulk, to Sholāpūr, which 'Ādil Shāh was then besieging, and after a severe battle the Bijāpūr army was defeated.

² She is called a *سُوء* by Nizām ud-dīn. She is *امه نام مولی* in the lith ed of Firishtah, and in Col Briggs's History (vol III, p 215), "Ameena a dancing girl." Firishtah says, Burhān made her the chief of his harem, and from her he learned to drink intoxicating liquors, and, owing to this, Mukammal Khān who was his *vakīl* and *vazīr* during his minority and had worked with zeal and ability, resigned his office. It is also mentioned by Firishtah that when in 931 A.H. Burhān Shāh married Bibī Mariām, the sister of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh, Bibī Āmina did not treat her well, and she complained to her brother, and there was a war between Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk and his allies Amīr Barīd, and 'Alā-ud dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk on the one hand and Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh on the other in which 'Imād-ul-mulk was defeated and retired in precipitation to Kāwil, and Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk became unconscious, through heat and thirst, and was carried away in a *pālki* to Ahmadnagar.

At that time ¹ Ram Rāj of Bijanagar which in the Hindi language is known as Bedbānagar had acquired much strength and power Husain Nizam ul mulk with Ādil Khan and Quṭb ul mulk and Malik Barid attacked him ³ Ram Rāj advanced to meet them with

¹ It appears from Sewell's *A Forgotten Empire—Vijayanagar* p 109 that Rām Rāj or Rāma Rāya as Mr Sewell calls him was not the titular Raja of Vijayanagar Sadāiva who succeeded Achvuta in 104 A D was the Rāja *de jure* but he was virtually a prisoner in the hands of Rāmā Rāya the eldest of three brothers at first nominally his minister but afterwards independent

* * * These three men held the government of the kingdom till 1560 when the empire was utterly overthrown by a confederation of the five Muhammadan kings of the Dakhan already mentioned at the battle of Talikota—so called—and the magnificent capital was almost wiped out of existence It appears also from Mr Sewell's *History* p 184 note 1 that Rāmā Rāya was married to a daughter of Krishna Deva who was king of Vijayanagar from 1509 to 1530 A D

The name is سد مانگر and سد مانگر in the MS and سدا نگر in the lith ed In text سد مانگر

³ This is a very brief and incorrect account of the relations between the Nizām Shāhī rulers and those of Bijānagar and the final defeat and death of Rām Rāj It appears from Firūshah that the relations between Burhān Nizām Shāh and Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh were strained and in 900 Burhān Shah sent Shāh Tahir to congratulate Jamshid Quṭb Shāh on his accession and on that occasion he instigated Rām Rāj and Quṭb Shāh to invade and conquer a part of the Ādil Shāhī dominion Ādil Shāh however conciliated both Nizām Shah and Rām Rāj Some time after that Burhān Shāh at the instigation of Ram Rāj advanced to Gulbarga Ādil Shah went forward to meet Ram Rāj and a great battle ensued in which Burhān Shāh was at first victorious but in the end he was attacked by Ādil Shah when his troops were engaged in plundering and was signally defeated and fled to Ahmadnagar leaving behind his royal umbrella and standards and elephants and artillery

After various other operations and after the death of Shah Tahir Burhān Nizām Shāh again resolved to attack the Bijāpur territory and sent ambassadors to Ram Rāj The latter was put to great straits by the Marhatta cavalry under Ibrāhīm Ādil Shah Burhān Nizām Shah attacked Ādil Shah's camp when he and his nobles and soldiers were engaged in celebrating the *Id* and slew many of them and compelled the rest to run away in all haste After this Kalan was surrendered by the garrison In the mean time Ādil Shah marched into the Nizām Shāhī territory and devastated Bir and other *parganas* and laid siege to Parinda and captured it After that Ādil Shah went back to Bijāpur and Burhan Nizām Shah marched towards Parinda The *thanadar*

one hundred thousand horsemen and two thousand elephants and arranged them in order of battle and it was likely that the four

being panic struck left the place and Nizām Shāh recaptured it, and made it over to Khwājah Jahān, and returned to Ahmadnagar

He again opened negotiations with Rām Rāj and passing through the Bijāpūr territory met him in the neighbourhood of Rāichūr, and they settled that Rāichūr and Mudkal should be seized, and should belong to Rām Rāj and Sholāpūr and Gulbarga to Burhān Shāh. They accordingly seized these forts. In 960, Burhān Shāh and Rām Rāj again invaded the Bijāpūr territory, and settled that they should besiege the fort of Sāghur and Etgar, and should seize the whole of the neighbouring territory up to the river Bīmā and then seize Bijāpūr and Gulbarga. In 961 when they advanced towards Bijāpūr, ‘Ādil Shāh being unable to meet them retired to Panāla. Burhān Shāh was engaged in the siege of Bijāpūr and was about to seize it when he fell ill and going back to Ahmadnagar died there. Firishtah points out that Mahmūd Shāh of Gujrat and Salīm Shāh Sūr died in the same year.

After the accession of Husain Nizām Shāh and the death of Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh the former sent ambassadors to Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh and they marched from their respective capitals, and met at Gulbarga and laid siege to it, and were about to capture it, when Mustafa Khān Ardistānī, the minister of Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh persuaded the latter to detach himself from Husain Nizām Shāh, and the latter had to return to his capital without attaining his object. ‘Alī ‘Ādil Shāh who had succeeded Ibrāhīm ‘Ādil Shāh now entered into an alliance with Rām Rāj and Qutb Shāh in order to retaliate the injury done to him. Husain Nizām Shāh sent Mullā ‘Alī Mazandarānī to Dairā ‘Imād ul-mulk of Berār, and the emissary succeeded in bringing about an interview between his master and ‘Imād ul-mulk near Sōnpat (the lith. ed. of Firishtah says on the bank of the Ganges, but Col. Briggs says, more correctly, on the bank of the Godavari), and a marriage was arranged and celebrated with great splendour between the daughter of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and Husain Nizām Shāh.

Sometime after, in the year 967 A.H., ‘Alī ‘Ādil Shāh with Rām Rāj and Qutb Shāh advanced towards Ahmadnagar. Husain Nizām Shāh's minister suggested that he should surrender the fort of Kahān to ‘Ādil Shāh and make peace with the latter. Husain Nizām Shāh did not agree, and said that it would be a matter of discredit to him, if he would surrender a fort which his father had conquered with the sword. The allies arrived at Ahmadnagar with one *lakh* of horsemen and two *lakhs* of foot soldiers. Husain Nizām Shāh left Ahmadnagar in charge of his officers, and retired towards Pattan, so that he might get Dairā ‘Imād-ul-mulk, and Mirān Mubāiak Shāh Fārūqī and ‘Alī Barīd to unite with him. It so happened, however, that Khān Jahān, brother of Amīr Barīd, who was in charge of ‘Imād-ul-mulk's affairs, not only dissuaded the latter from helping Husain Nizām Shāh, but proceeded himself with five

rulers should meet with a defeat when by an act of fate a cannon ball shot from the army of Nizam ul mulk hit Ram Raj and killed

thou and horsemen and foot soldiers to devastate Husain Nizam Shah's territories. He was however defeated by Shah Mulla Muhammad Nashapur, whom Husain Nizam Shah sent against him. In the meantime the allied sovereigns laid siege to Ahmadnagar but Qutb Shah thinking that it would be unwise that Adil Shah would have too great a power over Husain Nizam Shah allowed free passage for provisions and emissaries of Husain Nizam Shah to enter the fort through his lines. Adil Shah and Ram Raj coming to know this demanded an explanation from Qutb Shah who without giving it left in the night and went back to Golkonda. Ram Raj and Adil Shah finding it difficult to maintain their position retired to the town of Ashti and there planned that they should first seize the fort of Parinda and afterwards return and capture Ahmadnagar. Husain Nizam Shah then made overtures to Ram Raj for peace. Ram Raj agreed on three conditions all of which Husain Nizam Shah found it necessary to accept. Husain Nizam Shah made over the keys of Kalan to Ram Raj in fulfilment of one of the latter's conditions and he sent them to Ali Adil Shah.

In the beginning of 970 A.H. Husain Nizam Shah and Qutb Shah met in the neighbourhood of Kalan and proceeded to lay siege to it and were about to capture it when Ram Raj and Adil Shah arrived in that neighbourhood with a large army. Burhan Imad ul mulk who had succeeded his father and Ali Barid joined Adil Shah. Husain Nizam Shah then raised the siege and sent away his heavy luggage and his son and other members of his family towards the fort of Ausa and he himself intending to give battle to the enemy encamped at a distance of six *karohs* from them. The next day Husain Nizam Shah advanced to carry on a *ghazad* against Ram Raj and Qutb Shah also marched forward with such men as he had against Ali Adil Shah and his Musalman allies. It so happened that although it was not the rainy season there was heavy rain that day and Husain Nizam Shah's guns etc. were rendered useless. Ram Raj and Ali Adil Shah becoming aware of this attacked Qutb Shah's camp and he fled without making a struggle and took up a position behind Husain Nizam Shah's camp. Husain Nizam Shah now saw that it was impossible for him to do anything and retired towards his capital. He was pursued but he showed such dauntless courage that the pursuers after a time turned back. He then came to Ahmadnagar via Ausa. Ali Adil Shah, Ram Raj and their allies marched towards Ahmadnagar when Husain Nizam Shah leaving the capital in charge of his officers retired to Junir. The Hindus of Ram Raj's army destroyed mosques and palaces and committed outrages on the women. Ali Adil Shah was shocked at this but could not prevent it. He however advised Ram Raj to raise the siege and to go in pursuit of Husain Nizam Shah. Ram Raj agreed and they went after Husain Nizam Shah. The latter retired to the hilly country after

him His army was routed, and much booty fell into the hands of the *amīrs* of the Deccan Husain Nizām-ul-mulk ruled for thirty years He left two sons Murtadā and Burhān

directing some of his officers to hover round the hostile army, and to carry out *guerilla* warfare They did so with much success, and as the rains were approaching, Rām Rāj encamped near the river Sen There was heavy rain and the river was flooded, and about twenty thousand men and three hundred elephants and innumerable cattle were swept away, and drowned On account of this catastrophe Rām Rāj started for his own country and Ādil Shāh proceeded to Naldurg and repaired the fort Rām Rāj under the pretext of going to devastate portions of the Bijapur and Golkonda territories, eventually obtained the cession of parts of those territories, before retiring to his country

After this in 972 A.H., Husain Nizām Shāh and Āli Ādil Shāh entered into matrimonial and political alliances, and they also secured the alliance of the other Musalmān sovereigns, except Burhān Imād ul mulk, for the destruction of Rām Rāj Nizām Shāh and Qutb Shāh and Ādil Shāh and Barīd advanced with their armies, and crossed the Krishnā, and encamped at a distance of six *farōhs* from it Rām Rāj advanced with a formidable army to meet them, and they thinking that it would be impossible to withstand him made overtures for peace Rām Rāj refused to listen to them There was a great battle, in which the Hindūs were defeated, mainly owing to the attack by Husain Nizām Shāh's artillery Rām Rāj was taken prisoner, when his *sinhāsana* or throne on which he was riding was thrown down by the bears when they were charged by some of Husain Nizām Shāh's elephants He was recognised, and taken to Husain Nizām Shāh, who ordered him immediately to be beheaded This battle is known as the battle of Talikota though according to Mr Sewell, see note 2, page 199 of his book, it did not take place at Talikota is a small fortress and town near the Krishnā 'The battle took place ten miles from Rām Rāj's camp south of the river, wherever it might have been' Mr Sewell thinks it probable that it took place near the celebrated fort of Mudkal "The ford crossed by the allies would appear to be that at the bend of the river at Ingali, and the decisive battle seems to have been fought in the plain about the little village of Bāyapur to Bhōgar on the road leading directly from Ingali to Mudkal" Col Briggs has also pointed out that the battle "has been called the battle of Talikote by the Mahomedans because the headquarters of the several sovereigns were near that village The battle was fought on the south bank of the Krishna, near twenty rulers off" (See footnote, page 126, vol III of his History)

This again is a very long note, but I have considered it necessary to insert it so that there might be a correct narrative of the events, as far as that could be ascertained by a reference to Firishtah

AN ACCOUNT OF MURTADA NIZAM UL MULK

By the order and testamentary direction of his father he succeeded the latter. He was benevolent and friendly to the poor.
¹ Khwajah Mirak Harvi (of Herāt) was his minister in the beginning of

¹ According to Firishtah Murtada's mother Khunza Humayūn (called Khoonza Sooltana by Col Briggs) carried on the government for six years with Mulla Ināyat ul lah as the *peshwa* and in accordance with the advice of Qasim Bēg Hakim. She raised her three brothers to the highest rank of nobility and sat daily with Mulla Ināyat ul lah to transact public business from behind the *parda*. At this time Alī Ādil Shāh advanced against the Hindūs of Bijanagar. Venkatādri the brother of Rām Rāj applied to Khunza Humayūn for help. She led an army into the Bijāpūr territory and compelled Alī Ādil Shah to retire. Peace was however soon made between the two Musalmān princes and they entered into an alliance against Tufal Khān the prime minister of Burhān Imad Shah who had seized his master's dominions and who had not joined them in their invasion of Bijanagar. They plundered the country and on the approach of the rains Tufal Khān propitiated Alī Ādil Shah and the Ādil Shāh and Nizām Shāh's armies returned to their respective territories.

In 976 A.H. Alī Ādil Shah invaded the Ahmadnagar territory. Khunza Humayūn sent some *amirs* against the Ādil Shāh's army which was under Kishwar Khān but the latter defeated them and they retired to Ahmadnagar. After this some of the courtiers of Murtada Nizām Shah told the latter that on account of Khunza Humayūn's partiality to her brothers and other favourites the army was in a wretched condition. They suggested that she should be seized and after some delay Murtada Nizām agreed. They were preparing to enter the harem when Khunza Humayūn sent for Murtada Nizām and the latter thinking that his mother had discovered the plot made a clean breast of it in order to exculpate himself. She put one of the conspirators under arrest and the others escaped. Some of them went to Bijāpūr and some to Gujrat. Khunza Humayūn gave them assurances of safety and asked them to return.

Then in 977 A.H. she started with her son against Kishwar Khān the Bijāpūr general. In the course of the month Murtada Nizām Shāh determined to take the government into his own hands and sent a message to that effect to his mother. She came out on horseback ready armed but she was soon seized and her attendants fled. Murtada Nizām Shah now returned to Ahmadnagar and levying additional forces attacked the fort of Dārūr and seized it in a very dramatic manner after Kishwar Khān had been slain by an arrow which hit him on his breast. Murtada Nizām Shah then invaded Bijāpūr but shortly after that a treaty was concluded between him and Alī Ādil Shāh.

his reign, and had the title of Changīz Khān conferred on him. He conquered the country of Berār from ¹ Tufāl Khān, and annexed it to the territories of Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk. After the death of Changīz Khān, it so happened, that a relationship of passion (دوستی) was produced between Nizām-ul-mulk and the son of a bird-seller. He conferred on him the title of Musāhib Khān, and made ³ him his *talil*. That wretch having stretched his hands for plunder and ravage, went into people's houses, and stretched his hands over their families and children. He also endeavoured to put to death such of the *amīrs* as he believed to be unlikely to obey.

It was sometime after this, that Khwājah Mirak had the title of Changīz Khān conferred on him, and was appointed as the *talil*.

¹ The name is 'Ādil Khān instead of Tufāl Khān in the text edition.

² Nizām ud dīn does not mention the circumstances under which the death of Changīz Khān took place. According to Firishtah Shāh Mīrzā Isfahānī, who was *hājib* or chamberlain of Qutb Shāh learned that Nizām Shāh's army would march against Bidar. He first of all offered a large bribe to Changīz Khān so that he might give up the idea of the invasion. Changīz Khān indignantly refused the bribe, upon which Shāh Mīrzā Isfahānī bribed Sāhib Khān, whom Firishtah describes as a *معه نظام الملک*, and Col. Briggs as a favourite minion of the king, and told him to report to Nizām Shāh that Changīz Khān wanted to make himself the ruler of Berār. Murtada Nizām Shāh at first did not believe the report, but Sāhib Khān persisted in the accusation, and referred Nizām Shāh to Shāh Mīrzā Isfahānī. The Sultān sent for him, and Shāh Mīrzā of course corroborated Sāhib Khān's statement. Murtada Nizām Shāh then gave some credence to the accusation, but to make assurance doubly sure, he told Changīz Khān, that he was tired with the long stay in the camp, and wanted to go back to Ahmadnagar. Changīz Khān told him that he should remain there for sometime longer. This confirmed the Shāh's suspicions and his demeanour towards Changīz Khān changed. The latter perceived this, and for some days, on the pretext of illness, he did not go and wait on Murtada Shāh. This confirmed the latter's belief and he sent a *halīm* to Changīz Khān with a poisoned draught, which he was to represent as a medicine. Changīz Khān at first refused to drink it, but in the end remembering Murtada Shāh's kindnesses to him, drank it off, after writing a petition to the latter.

It will be seen from the above that Sāhib Khān was already a minion of the Sultān, before the death of Changīz Khān.

³ This does not agree with Firishtah's account. According to him, Murtada Nizām Shāh first made Hakīm Muhammad Mīrī his *talil*, but after six months dismissed him and appointed Qādī Beg Yazdī to that post. But Firishtah also mentions the outrages committed by Sāhib Khān on the people, and even on the *amīrs*.

his behests After a time he marched to attack the *amirs* of Berar among whom were Mir Murtada and *Khudwand Khan* and others As the latter knew his intention they forestalled him and slew him

Murtada Nizam Shah grieved much and saw no remedy except in madness At this time the derangement of his brain became violent and he secluded himself in ³*Bagh-i Bihisht* (the garden of paradise) and never came out of it He also did not allow any one to go near him and it was only rarely that any one was received in audience At all times the *amirs* were engaged in the affairs of the state and maintained the stability of the government If a matter of importance had to be dealt with they submitted a written report to him and he wrote a reply to it

When six years had passed in this way ⁴His Majesty the *Khalifa-i Ilahi* sent Pishrau *Khan* who was one of the old servants of the threshold to the Deccan so that he might acquaint himself with the state of things in that country and submit a report about them

¹ The manner in which he was killed is described by *Firishtah* It would appear that he left the court in anger Murtada Nizam Shah sent some men to call him back and they put him to death and represented to Murtada Nizam Shah that he fell when resisting their endeavours to take him back

The meaning of this is not clear It would appear from *Firishtah's* account that he was in his senses but he became convinced that he could not administer justice to his subjects and so freed himself from all responsibilities and left everything in charge of his minister and himself went into retirement

³ According to *Firishtah* he first retired to an apartment inside the fort of Ahmadnagar which was called *Baldad* and later to a garden house called *Hasht Bihisht* Col Briggs says that the garden and the palace in it were still to be seen in Ahmadnagar in his time It was then known as the *Behisht-i Bagh* (vol III page 961)

⁴ *Firishtah* does not appear to mention the mission of Pishrau *Khan* but he says that in 984 A H Akbar came to the frontiers of Malwa hunting On receiving information of this Murtada Nizam Shah at once started for Daulatabad in a *palki* with only about one hundred followers The *amirs* submitted to him that it would be unwise to advance with such a small force He waited for sometime till six thousand or seven thousand of his special troop had assembled His generals again represented that it would be better to wait for his artillery He did not agree to this but the scouts brought information at this time that Akbar had gone back to his capital Murtada Nizam Shah then returned to Ahmadnagar and again secluded himself in *Hasht Bihisht*

When Pishrau Khān arrived at Ahmadnagar, Asad Khān Rūmī, who was at that time the *vakīl* of Murtada Nizām Shāh, and who communicated with the latter when from time to time he felt somewhat better and was in his right mind, brought him out, and he had an interview with Pishrau Khān. Murtada Nizām Shāh then expressed his sincerity and faithful service to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī. Pishrau Khān said, "His Majesty has ordered me that I should ascertain the cause of your secluding yourself." He replied, "There are many men round me, and the revenues of my kingdom are not sufficient for the payment of their expenses. I come out rarely on account of my being ashamed of men." He sent back Pishrau Khān with much tribute and elephants of immense size.

It so happened that ¹Burhān brother of Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk escaped from prison, and rose in revolt. The *amīrs* brought out Murtada, and defeated Burhān. The latter fled, and went as a suppliant to the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, and received imperial favours. Murtada again secluded himself in that garden. No one went near him. This happened in the year 996 A.H. A period of three years passed in this way. There was war several times between the armies of Nizām-ul-mulk and 'Adil Khān, and peace was each time made. A Circassian (Kairjī) slave of Shāh Tahmāsp of the name of Salābat Khān acquired an ascendancy in the service of Nizām-ul-mulk, and became his minister plenipotentiary. Mīr Murtada and Khudāwand Khān and the other *jāgīrdār amīrs* of Berār had enmity with Salābat Khān. They came with a large force, and attacked Ahmadnagar. Salābat Khān fought with them and defeated them. The Berār *amīrs* then fled, and went for protection to the threshold of the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, which was the asylum of the world. They obtained reinforcements there, and again came back to Berār. An account of these events has already been given in its place.

¹ According to Firishtah the revolt of Burhān took place before the death of Shāhib Khān. Burhān escaped from the fort of Junīr, and was defeated by Salābat Khān, and fled to Bijūpūr. He returned again, when some disaffected *amīrs* conspired to place him on the throne, but the plot was discovered by Salābat Khān, and he had again to make his escape. After that he sought an asylum in Akbar's Court.

In his old days Murtada Nizām ul mulk became enamoured of a ¹ prostitute of the name of Fattū. On account of the fact that a Saivīd named Mir Bihishtī had this woman in his house for some time and he had a son of the name of Isma'il by another woman Fattū used to describe Isma'il as her brother. Isma'il became the *talīf* of Nizām Shāh and put Šalābat Khān in prison. They say that he showed a writing with a *س* from Nizām ul mulk to the effect that Šalābat Khān should remain in a fortress (or prison). Šalābat Khān sent for a ² litter and getting into it ³ went to the fortress. Although the men in charge of the fort said that Murtada Nizām ul mulk was not in his right senses and did not know anything about the order and loyalty and faithfulness to the salt required that he should

¹ She is called *فاحشه نورنام* in the MSS and in the lith ed Firīhtah call her *فاحشه نورنام* and Col Briggs has Futeh Shah a dancer and he described her apparently as a man and not as a woman (vol III page 64)

One MS has *نورنام ناصر نظام الملک*. The other MS omits *نورنام* while the lith ed has *ناصر*. The *ناصر* is an abbreviation of *ناصر* (correct) and is equivalent to a signature

² Both MSS have *لوتی* but the lith ed has *پل*

³ Firīhtah also says that Šalābat Khān in a quixotic spirit of loyalty immured himself in the fort of Dandrājpūr. He gives a detailed account of the causes of Murtada Nizām Shāh's displeasure with him. First of all there was some trouble about some very curious and valuable necklaces which Fattū demanded. Šalābat Khān in consultation with the other ministers had two copies of the necklaces made and made them over to her. She found out that the necklaces given to her were copies and complained to Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh. Another cause was that Murtaḍa Nizām Shāh took it into his head at the suggestion of the women about him that his son Mirān Husain wanted to dethrone him and attempted to put him to death. Šalābat Khān refused to make the Shāh-zāda over to him and put the matter off. At this time Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh invaded the Nizām Shāh's dominions and demanded that the marriage of his sister with Shāh-zāda Mirān Husain should be celebrated or the bride should be sent back to Bijāpūr. Šalābat Khān refused compliance with the demand unless Sholapur should be first ceded to Nizām Shāh. Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh becoming angry at this besieged Ausa. Murtada Nizām Shāh was enraged with Šalābat Khān and after reproaching him said 'I am tired of your disobedience but I have no power to put you into prison.' Šalābat Khān said 'Name a fortress and I shall put myself in chains and go and shut myself up there.' Murtada Nizām Shāh named the fort of Dandrājpūr and Šalābat Khān at once went and shut himself up there.

attend to the welfare of his master, he did not accept this argument, and said "I have nothing to do with these contentions I have no alternative except obedience"

When Salābat Khān ceased to be in the way ¹Ismā'il became the *vakīl mutlaq* (minister with absolute power), and he and the woman Fattū acquired complete power and authority Ismā'il committed various acts of tyranny and oppression As he had made ² Hasan 'Alī, son of Sultān Husain Sabazwārī his *nāyib*, and had conferred the title of Mīrzā Khān on him, the latter when the tyranny and violence (of Ismā'il) went beyond all bounds, got most of the *amīrs* to join him, and made himself the *vakīl* of Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk When he found the field unoccupied, the ambition to rule got into his head, and he released (Mīrān) Husain, the son of Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk, who had nearly attained his majority, and was imprisoned in a fort, and made him the ruler of the country ³ They

¹ Firishtah, however, says that Murtada Nizām Shāh made Qāsim Bēg Hakīm his *vakīl*, and Mīrzā Muhammad Taqī Nāzīrī his *vazīr*

² According to Firishtah, however, it was Sultān Husain Sabazwārī himself and not his son who was made regent with the title of Nāzīr Khān, by Murtada Nizām Shāh, because the other minister did not agree to the latter's proposal to effect the destruction of Shāhzāda Mīrān Husain

³ Nizām-ud dīn's account of the way in which Murtada Nizām Shāh was killed is correct but incomplete He has omitted all mention of an attempt by Murtada Nizām Shāh to burn his son Mīrān Husain to death He told his ministers, Qāsim Bēg Hakīm and Mīrzā Muhammad Taqī Nāzīrī that he had great longing to see his son They were very thankful to God for this change in their master's disposition, and sent the Shāhzāda into the fort Murtada at first showed much affection towards the prince, and put him in a chamber near Bāghdād (see page 147, note 3) Then he set fire to the bed clothes, and shut the doors from the outside When Mīrān Shāh woke up he ran to the door, and called out for help Fatahī Shāh, it must be said to her credit, opened the door, and sent the prince to the ministers There was not, therefore, very much to choose between the father and the son, but it may be said that the former was, or affected to be mad But evidently there was much method in his madness

It may be mentioned here that Firishtah's account of the events in Murtada Nizām Shāh's reign is that of a contemporary, who took part in some of the events, which he has recorded According to his account, he was employed by Murtada Nizām Shāh to watch Nāzīr Khān, when the latter turned against him, and took up the cause of Shāhzāda Mīrān Shāh

threw Murtada Nizām ul mulk into a hot (Turkish) bath and shut all the doors and the poor man died of the heat. The rule of Murtada Nizām ul mulk extended to twenty six years and some months

AN ACCOUNT OF HUSAIN NIZĀM UL MULK SON OF MURTADA NIZĀM UL-MULK WHO WAS CALLED MİRĀN HUSĀIN

Mirza Khān kept him as a figurehead and himself carried on the government. ¹The prince on account of his youth was occupied during the whole of his time in pleasure and dissipation and in cock fights and in wandering about in the *baḡar*. He roamed about during most of the time in the lanes and *ba ars* in a drunken state in the company of women of the town and committed harsh and offensive acts. ²As the strength and power of Mirza Khān went beyond all bounds the old *amirs* of the Deccan became jealous and envious of him and induced the young and inexperienced Husain Nizām ul mulk to get rid of him. Accordingly ³a feast was arranged in the house of

¹ The character of Husain Nizām ul mulk as given by Firishtah does not quite agree with that given by Nizām ud din. Firishtah also says that he was a young man of dissolute character but he was also of a cruel and savage disposition. When he went about in a drunken state in the city he killed men whom he met and who were guilty of no crime whatever with arrows and musket shots and the sword.

Before this however according to Firishtah some of his associates informed Husain Shāh that Mirza Khān had brought Husain Shāh's uncle from the fort of Asir (the lith ed has *أسير* and Col Briggs vol III p. 68 Joonere) and was keeping him concealed in his house with the object of placing him on the throne after deposing Husain Shah. The latter ordered Mirza Khān to be placed in imprisonment but when the accusation was found to be false he reinstated him and increased his honours. Mirza Khān suggested that in order to prevent future accusations of this kind all the surviving male members of the royal family should be put to death and fifteen persons namely his uncles and their male offsprings were put to death in one day.

³ The account of this feast in the text agrees severely with that given by Firishtah. The name of the man who gave the feast is also Ankas Khān in the lith ed of Firishtah but Col Briggs vol III p. 71 Bungush Khān. The man who became ill or according to Firishtah feigned to be ill as previously arranged with Mirza Khān was according to Firishtah Aqa Mir Sharwānī and the date of the feast was Thursday the 1st Jamādi ul awwal 997 A H. Col Briggs gives the 10th Jumadool awwal 997 A H. March 15th 1588 A D. as the date

Ankas Khān who was a foster-brother (a son of the wet-nurse) of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, and was of the same age as he, and Mirzā Khān was invited to it. He, however, got information of the intention (of his enemies) and did not attend the feast, sending excuses for his absence. It so happened that after the feast Sayyid Murtada Sharwānī, a friend of Mirzā Khān, who was among those who had come to the feast, got up vomiting and cried out and complained that they had given him poison. Mirzā Khān went and saw Sayyid Murtada, and after having arranged matters went to wait on Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, he told the latter "Sayyid Murtada is a ¹ man highly esteemed, and is lying on the bed of death, and air and water (climate or atmosphere) inside the fort are salubrious. He might if you so order, be there for some days." ² After obtaining permission he sent the man to the fort. ³ On the following day, he again waited on Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, and took him to enquire about the health of Sayyid Murtada, and then imprisoned him, (i.e., Husain Nizām-ul-mulk), in an apartment there.

Couplet

Place not thy foot on the path of deceit and fraud
For in the end, in the net of danger thou must be caught

¹ The actual words are "مردی عربی اور" Firishtah has یکی اور امراء بزرگ. ^۱ e, is one of your great *amīrs* است.

² The account given by Nizām-ud-dīn of the way, in which the incarceration of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk was effected, is consistent. That given by Firishtah is somewhat different, and is rather confused. He says that Mirzā Khān reported to Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, that Āqā Mīr Sharwānī should be sent *outside* the fort, and should be allowed to live in a part of *his* (i.e., the Sultān's) own palace. Afterwards Mirzā Khān went and reported that Āqā Mīr's condition was serious, and suggested that it would be a great kindness on his part if he would go, and enquire after his health. Husain Nizām-ul-mulk then rode into the fort, with two or three companions, and was at once placed in confinement.

³ The way in which the revolution was affected, as given by Firishtah, agrees mainly with that in the text. Firishtah however says, that two sons of Burhān, namely Ibrāhīm and Ismā'il, were brought from the fort of Lāhagar, where they had been imprisoned, so that one of them might be selected and placed on the throne, and eventually Ismā'il, the younger of the two who was only twelve years of age was chosen to be the puppet Sultān.

The doors were then shut and placed in charge of his (Mirza Khān) men Saiyid Murtada in complete health and strength sat at the gate of the fort and supervised everything. Mirzā Khān had Ankarā Khān also seized and put him into prison. He sent Mir Tahir son in law of Amin ul mulk to the fort and brought Isma'il son of Burhan who was the nephew of Murtada Nizam ul mulk out of prison and he was brought to Ahmadnagar.

When the news of the imprisonment of Husain Nizam ul mulk was bruited about ¹ Jamal Khān Gujrāṭī who was the commander of the *silahdars* and the slave Yaqut who had the title of Khudawand Khān united together and having secured the union of the soldiers and other men with themselves came in a crowd to the gate of the fort and commenced to fire cannon. Mirza Khān came to the gate and a great fight took place. Kishwar Khān the uncle in law (*khālā*) of Mirzā Khān and Ali Khān were slain. Mirza Khān and Saiyid Murtada and Jamshid Khān and Amin ul mulk and Bhāi Khān and

¹ The account of the way in which Jamal Khān came to support Husain Nizam ul mulk and the latter was murdered by Mirzā Khān and his partisans as given in the text agrees with that given by Firishtah. According to the latter however Jamāl Khān was the leader of the Dakins and Habshis and Mirza Khān of the foreigners other than the Habshis. He also says that Mirzā Khān did nothing when Jamāl Khān had five or six thousand horsemen and many men on foot including the people of the *be'ar* but later when twenty five thousand horsemen came to Jamāl Khān who was *Mahdawī* he encouraged the men in the fort by giving each one *lamīṇ* of red gold and sent out hundred and fifty *Qharib adas* seven *Qharibs* and twenty *Dakins* and one elephant (نعل) which had the name of Chulām Ali (the meaning is not at all clear) under his *Khalu* Muhammad Sa'id and Kishwar Khān (it is again not clear whether the men were both maternal uncles of Mirza Khān or only one of them or whether Muhammad Sa'id was the uncle's name and Kishwar Khān his title). Col Briggs does not help in this matter as he does not mention that Mirza Khān sent anybody from the fort to fight with Jamāl Khān's men. Kishwar Khān knew that it was impossible for him to do anything against such terrible odds. Still he came out and made brave onsets and he and most of the men perished. It was after this that Mirzā Khān ordered the head of Husain Nizam ul mulk to be cut off and fixed on a lance at the top of a bastion. After this some of the Dakins wanted to go back to their own houses but Jamāl Khān strenuously objected and he was selected as their leader and the gate of the fort was set on fire.

Khān Khānān and other men then decided to cut off the head of Husam, and to throw it outside the fort, under a mistaken idea, that then doing so would put an end to the disturbance. They also brought Ismā'il the son of Burhān and placed him on the top of a bastion and raised the royal umbrella over his head. They also proclaimed, that "as Husam was unfit to rule, he had met with his deserts, and Ismā'il Nizām-ul-mulk is now your ruler."

Jamāl Khān and the other *amīrs* seeing Husam's head fought with greater energy and set fire to the gate of the fort. Although Mīrzā Khān knocked on the door of peace, it had no effect. In the end ¹ Mīrzā Khān and his partisans came out of the fort, and took the path of flight. Mīrzā Khān escaped, but Jamshīd Khān and Bhāi Khān and Amīn-ul-mulk and Sayyid Murtada and other leaders were seized and put to death. As Mīrzā Khān was going away towards Junīr, some people recognised him, and seizing him brought him back. By the order of Jamāl Khān, he was torn limb from limb and was put in a cannon, and fired off. The hand of destruction was then raised and of the 'Irāqīs and Khurāsānīs and Mā-warā-an-nahrīs every one that was seized was slain.

Couplets

With my own eyes I saw, that on the path,
A small bird struck on the life of an ant,
But yet its beak had not finished the prey,
Another bird came and devoured it up

The women and children were carried away to captivity, and whole families were destroyed. About four thousand innocent persons, who had no connection whatever with the affairs, were murdered. On the whole wherever a man with a white skin was seen, he was killed.

The period of the rule of Husam Nizām-ul-mulk was about
² two months

¹ The account of the flight of Mīrzā Khān and his partisans and of the massacre which followed, as given in the text, agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah. There are some differences, but it is not necessary to mention them.

² Firishtah makes it two months and three days. ۸۱۰ ۸۵ ten months in the text-edition.

AN ACCOUNT OF ¹ISMA'IL NIZAM UL MULK SON OF BURHAN

When they desisted from the general massacre Jamal Khan raised Isma'il Nizam ul mulk to the seat of power and kept him as a puppet or figurehead and himself carried on the government Isma'il in spite of the fact of his ³youth perpetrated harsh and cruel acts They say that he was passing one day through the *ba'ar* and his eye fell on a group of Kashmiris As he saw that they had white skins he enquired why they also had not been slain

In short Jamal Khan having acquired complete ascendancy the duty of carrying on the Nizam ul mulkī government devolved on him On account of a dispute which cropped up between the Nizam ul mulkī and the Ādil Shahī governments on the border of the two territories ⁴he invaded the Ādil Shahī country and fought a battle and was victorious and three hundred elephants were taken by him as part of the plunder

¹ According to Firishtah Ibrahīm the elder brother of Isma'il was born of a Habshī mother and had a dark complexion and an unprepossessing appearance Ima'l was a son of a daughter of one of the Nawabats of the Kohan (Concan) and possessed both good qualities and looks The fact mentioned by N zām ud dīn about his remark about the Kashmiris does not show that he possessed the former According to Firishtah Jamāl Khan was a *Mahdawī* and he initiated Isma'il in the doctrines of that sect After this Šalabat Khān who was imprisoned in the fort of Kehrla on the borders of Berar hearing of the murder of Miran Husain and being aggrieved at the power of the *Mahdawīs* rose in revolt but Jamal Khān defeated him in the neighbourhood of Pattan and made him retire towards Burhanpūr He then marched to meet the Ādil Shahī forces and the two armies met near Āshtī They confronted each other for fifteen days after which peace was concluded on an agreement that Jamāl Khān should send back the *pulki* of the mother Mirān Husain Shāh with seventy thousand *hans* as *Valbaha* This is what is mentioned in the lith ed of Firishtah but Col Briggs says that the agreement was that Chand Beeby the widow of Ally Adil Shah and aunt to the present King of Ahmudnuggur should be sent to the Beejapoor Camp and the Nizam Shahy Government should pay two hundred and seventy thousand hoons (Valbaha) (vol III p - 8)

The word is *بردا حند* in one MS It is *بردا حند* in the other and in the lith ed

³ The lith ed has *حورد سال و* only *معمر مس* has been adopted in the text edition

⁴ This invasion and victory took place according to Firishtah at a somewhat later period.

At this time, ¹ Burhān, brother of Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk, who had entered the service of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, having heard of the disturbances in the Deccan, came there in the year 997 A H, in accordance with a *farmān* of the threshold, which was the asylum of all people and with its help and assistance, he came to

¹ According to Firishtah, Akbar, on hearing of the accession of Ismā'il Nizām-ul-mulk, sent for Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk from Bangash, where he had a fief, and offered to send him to the Deccan with an army so that he might take possession of his ancestral dominions. Burhān said "people would be averse to join me, if I go with a Mughal army, let me go alone to conciliate the people, and bring them over to my side." Akbar agreed to this and gave him *pargana* Hāndia as a *jāqīr* and also sent a *farmān* to Rāja 'Alī Khān to help him. Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk sent *qaulnāmas* to the *zamīndārs* of the country of Ahmadnagar. They expressed their willingness to join him. He then marched with a small force by way of Gōndwāna into Berār, but Jahāngīr Khān Habshī, who had agreed to join him, now turned against him, and met him in battle. Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk was defeated and retired to Hāndia. After this, he obtained the help of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh, and Rāja 'Alī Khān, and came to Burhānpūr, and began to collect troops. Jamāl Khān then consulted with other *Mahdawīs*, and Sayyid Amjad ul-mulk Mahdawī was made commander of the Berār forces to meet Rāja 'Alī Khān and Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, and Jamāl Khān himself advanced to meet Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh. He met Dilāwar Khān Habshī, the leader of the 'Ādil Shāhī army at Darsang, and defeated him and seized three hundred elephants. Jamāl Khān was still there, when he heard that the *amīrs* of Berār had submitted to Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. He then with great pomp and splendour advanced to meet the latter. Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk on the advice of 'Ādil Shāh and Rāja 'Alī Khān, ordered the Marhatta horse to hover about Jamāl Khān's camp and to cut off their supply of grain and fodder. Owing to this, many deserted Jamāl Khān and joined Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. When Jamāl Khān reached the Rōhangīr Ghāt, he found that Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk's men had blocked it. He attempted to get through by another way, which was very difficult, and his army suffered much from heat and thirst. When they came near a place, where they had hoped to get some water, they found that Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk had already occupied it. At last they found a place where there was a little water, and Jamāl Khān and his partisans resolved to fight at once, after quenching their thirst a little. The battle was fought on the 13th of Rajab 999 A H, and Jamāl Khān was about to gain a victory, when he was struck on the forehead by a bullet from a musket, and killed. His partisans fled, but some of them and Ismā'il Nizām-ul-mulk were seized. Ismā'il was sent to attend his father Burhān. Col Briggs says he was confined by his father, and deprived of his throne (vol III, page 281).

the country of Berar and with the help of Rājā Ali Khān ruler of Asir and Burhanpur took possession of it. At this time Jamal Khān advanced rapidly with much pride and haughtiness to attack Burhan ul mulk and fought with him and was killed. The country of Ahmadnagar and Berar then came into the possession of Burhan Nizam ul mulk and up to this day which is in the year 1002 A.H. he occupies the place of his ancestors.

The period of the rule of Imād was about two years.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF BURHAN NIZAM UL MULK SON
OF HUSAIN SON OF BURHAN WHO IS THE BROTHER
OF MURTADA

For a long time he was kept in imprisonment by order of his brother. By chance he escaped and went to Bijapur and was in the court of ¹ Adil Khān. From there he was summoned by some of the *amirs* and came to Ahmadnagar. As Murtada was alive and Salabat Khān was the *peshwa* he was unable to do anything. He then fled to Cujrat and went to Qutb ud din Muhammad Khān Chaznavi who was one of the great *amirs* of his Majesty the Khalifa al Ilāhi. After that he was honoured by being allowed to kiss the noble threshold. He was then made an *amir* of three hundred and a *jagir* was conferred on him. After some time he was made a commander of a thousand horse and sent to Mālwa. An army was then sent with Azam Khān (with orders) that he should free the Deccan from those intemperate and vulgar people and make it over to Burhan who was one of the servants of the threshold. Azam Khān arrived at Elchhpur which was the capital of Berar but nothing was done towards the conquest of the Deccan and he suddenly elected to return instead of standing firm. Burhan being disappointed again went to the threshold which was the asylum of the people. These matters have already been mentioned in their proper places.

After that he was appointed to attack the Afghans in concert with Sadīq Muhammad Khān. When the news of the disturbances

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have Adil Khān the other has Adil.

² The actual word in one of the MSS. and in the lith. ed. is *حاک کشمیری* in the other it is *برگسپاهی*. In the text edition M. H. Davat Hossain has rightly adopted *حاک برگسپاهی*.

in the Deccan again reached the noble ears, His Majesty summoned Burhān from the country of Bangash, and with much attention and great favour sent him (to the Deccan). A *farmān* to be obeyed by all the world was then issued to all the *amīrs* of the *ṣūba* of Mālwa, and to all *zamīndārs* and more specially to Rāja 'Alī Khān, son of Mubārak Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, that they should take such measures that Burhān, who had come for ¹protection to the threshold, should be placed in the seat of his brother. A noble *farmān* was also sent to Nāzi Bē Uzbek and his sons who had *jāgīrs* in Mālwa. Nazr Bē and his sons joined Burhān. Rāja 'Alī Khān, considering the service a means of increase in his position and dignity, advanced (to support Burhān). When Jamāl Khān who had gone to Bijāpūr, and defeated 'Ādil Khān and seized the large number of elephants, heard that Rāja 'Alī Khān was advancing, and intended to bring forward Burhān, he marched rapidly from Bijāpūr and arrived with ²some troops. Rāja 'Alī Khān, who had detached most of the useful of Jamāl Khān's men from him, by means of letters and messages, ³fought a battle. Men began to desert from Jamāl Khān's army one by one, and the artillery men leaving the guns, etc., unattended to, fled. Jamāl Khān thoroughly amazed at this, exerted himself in spite of the great confusion. At this time one of the musketeers, one of whose relations Jamāl Khān had put to death, ⁴fired at the latter, and he fell dead on the battle-field. Rāja 'Alī Khān sent Burhān with great honour and respect to Ahmadnagar. This event happened in the month of Rajab 999 A H. He (Burhān) is on the throne of government up to this ⁵date.

¹ One MS and the lith ed have the word *که پناه بدرگاه آورده است*, the other MS substitutes *که التماس بدرگاه آورده است*.

² The word cannot be made out. It is *رمکی* and *مکی*, in the MSS, and *مکھی* in the lith ed. The correct word *کمی* is adopted in the text-edition.

³ There are some variations in the readings. One MS has *اندک*. The other changes *بود* to *بودند* and then says *نگی*. The lith ed agrees with the first MSS, but substitutes *اندکی* for *اندک*.

⁴ I have translated the sentence as it is in the MSS. The lith ed has *او به ال خان رسیده باهم در معرکه افتادند*.

⁵ This is the end of the history of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty in one of the MSS, and in the lith ed, but the other MS takes the history onward to the

SECTION III THE DYNASTY OF ĀDIL KHĀN

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF YUSUF ĀDIL KHĀN

Ādil Khān who was the founder of the dynasty was a Circassian slave whom Khwajah Mahmud Garjistanī had sold to Mahmud Shah Bahmanī. Garjistan is a dependency of Gilan. Ādil Khān became possessed of the country of Sholapur as far as the river ³ Krishna in breadth and length from Dabul to Gulbarga and proclaimed

year 104 A H which was long after the death of Nizam ud din. As this is clearly an interpolation by some subsequent scribe I have not thought it fit to translate it. It may be mentioned however that it contains the account of the rules of Ibrāhīm son of Burhān of Bahādur son of Ibrāhīm and Husayn son of Bahādur. According to Firishtah Ibrāhīm succeeded Burhān. Then Ahmad son of Shāh Tāhur was set up but his title was disputed. After that the Mughals stormed Ahmadnagar. Chānd Bibi defended it with courage and intrepidity. The Mughals were repulsed but Berar was ceded to them. Then Bahādur Shāh's claim was established and Chand Bibi became the regent. After three years Ahmadnagar was annexed to Akbar's dominion and Bahādur was sent to Gwalior as a prisoner. After that Murtada Nizam Shah II was set up as king with Iarinda as his capital but the whole of the power was in the hands of Malik Ahmad.

¹ This is the heading in one MS. In the other it is *ادعادل خان که اول*.
اسان يوسف عادل خان اسب. The heading in the lith. ed. does not mention the dynasty but simply has *دکر*.

² The words *علامی حرکس بود* are taken from the lith. ed. The MSS. omit them. Firishtah gives a long and romantic account of the birth of Ādil Khān from which it appears that he was a son of Aḡla Murād (Amurath II) Sulṭān of Rūm (Constantinople). His elder brother Muhammad on his accession ordered him to be strangled to death but his mother smuggled him away and he was taken to the town of Sawā where he received a good education. His birth being afterwards divulged he had to leave Sawā and ultimately came to India.

Nizam ud din does not give any account of the events of his reign. Firishtah's account extends over about 13 pages of the lith. ed. and Col Briggs's translation over about 31 pages. According to Firishtah his rule began in the year 890 A H (1489 A D) and according to another account in 896 A H and he died in 915 A H (1510 A D) having ruled for twenty years and two months according to the lith. ed. of Firishtah and to twenty one year according to Col Briggs's translation. So that what little Nizam ud din says is incorrect. Mr Sewell also says that Ādil Shah proclaimed his independence in 1489 (page 106 of his book) and he died in 1510 A D (page 110).

³ *د* *د* *د* Kishtina in the text edition.

his independence. And in the end he acquired possession of Bijāpūr also, he ruled for seven years from the beginning of the year 909 to the year 913 A.H.

AN ACCOUNT OF ISMĀ'IL 'ĀDIL KHĀN, SON OF YŪSUF

¹ (He) sat in his father's place. He was brave and liberal-minded. He seized² Ankar and Sōkar and Noorātābād and the territory of Ansh and obtained the title of 'Ādil Khān Sawā'ī. As he had a territory equal to one quarter more than that of any of the other rulers of the Deccan he got the title of Sawā'ī. He had twelve thousand soldiers.

¹ According to Firishtah Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh (1509-1511) had a third son Kamāl Khān Dalimī to be the ruler of the Deccan. But Yūsuf's regent gradually usurped all the power, and it was decided by a conference of his creatures, held on the 1st Safar 917 (i.e. April 29th 1511), that on the 1st Rabi' ul Awwal Ismā'il would be deposed, and Kamāl Khān should have the *Khutba* read in his own name. The queen mother then had the regent assassinated by Yūsuf Turānī, the foster father of Ismā'il. After the Kamāl Khān's mother concealed her son's death, and directed her son Šafdar Khān to storm that part of the fort, in which Ismā'il and his family lived. They were panic-struck, but Dilshad Āghā, aunt of Ismā'il, who had come recently from Persia incited Ismā'il's attendants to oppose Šafdar. Both parties fought bravely, but in the end Šafdar, who had been wounded in the eye by an arrow, was killed by a stone being rolled upon him by Ismā'il, from the terrace on which he stood above him. Both Kamāl Khān and Šafdar Khān being dead, Ismā'il ascended the throne.

² These names are differently written in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. The first appears to be انكبر Ankbar, and اكلير Atkir in the MSS., and انكر Ankar in the lith. ed. The second and third are the same in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. The fourth is انچه and العمة, in the MSS., and انچه in the lith. ed. The first three places are انكبر, ساگر and مروتا باد, which according to Firishtah had been taken by Amīr Barīd during the lifetime of and in collusion with Kamāl Khān and were recovered by Mīrzā Jahāngīr. Col Briggs (vol. III, p. 46) calls them Etgeer, Sagar and Noosratabad. انكبر in the text edition.

³ *Sawā'ī* in Hindūstānī means one and one quarter. I cannot find any reference to the title in Firishtah. It may be that the title had reference to Yūsuf 'Ādil Shāh having come from Sawā'. See note 2, page 159. The word *Sawā'ī* is not in the heading in the MSS., but is in it in the lith. ed. Nizām ud-dīn does not give any real account of the reign of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh. Firishtah's account extends over about thirteen pages of the lith. ed. and Col Briggs's translation to about forty pages, but I do not think it necessary to

and well armed and well equipped horsemen most of whom were Mughals in his service and ¹ he looked after them with care Every year he sent ships to Hurmuz (Ormuz) and summoned men from Iraq and Khurasan They say that one day he was a guest in the house of Imad ul mulk Kaweli Imad ul mulk placed some dishes filled with gems and made a great show of offering them to his guests When Imad ul mulk became a guest of Isma'il Adil Khan the latter brought his army fully arrayed before his guest's eyes and said This is all that I have acquired I shall offer to you any one of my servants whom you may ask for He carried on three wars with Nizam ul mulk and was victorious each time He ruled for a period of twenty five years and then passed away

AN ACCOUNT OF ³IBRAHIM ADIL KHAN SON OF ISMA'IL KHAN

Through the exertions of the *amirs* he sat in his father's place Mallu Khan who was the elder brother applied to Asad Khan who

refer to any part of these as it is not necessary to elucidate any of the statements made by Nizam ud din

¹ The MSS have *نربست مکتود* but the lith ed has *کرد می کرد* *نگاه داشته تربست می کرد*

This anecdote is to be found in Firishtah also The horsemen are described the e as *lo aspa i e* having two horses riding one and leading the other

³ One MS inserts *حکومت* before the name Firishtah has a short section giving an account of the history of Mallu Adil Shah It appears that Isma'il Adil Shah died on the 16th Safar 941 A H (6th September 1534 A D) while he was besieging Nalkonda on the border of the Tilang country Col Briggs calls the fort Kowlconda Mr Sewell does not give the name of the fort but describes it as a fortress belonging to the Qutb Shahs see page 166 Isma'il Adil Shah's sons immediately began to contend with each other for the succession but Asad Khan Lari knowing that it would be dangerous for them to fall out in a hostile country told them that the time was inauspicious for the accession and that they should return to Gulbarga and after asking for inspiration from the spirit of Saiyid Muhammad Gesu Daraz select a Sultan The princes agreed Asad Khan was himself in favour of Ibrahim's succession but as Mallu was the elder brother and Isma'il had directed that he should be the successor Mallu was placed on the throne and Ibrahim was imprisoned in the fortress of Mirich

Mallu was however utterly unworthy to rule He was extremely vicious and dissolute and was deposed after six months both he and his younger brother Allu Khan being blinded by order of their grandmother

was the Amīr-ul-umarā Asa'd Khān raised him to the seat of authority, and he ruled for half a day (یکدم روز,¹ which may mean either half a day or a day and half) But Asa'd Khān afterwards repented of what he had done, and went away to² Malkapūr, which was his jāgīr. Mallu Khān was then taken prisoner by Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān, and he and his younger brother Ulugh Khān, were blinded by having the pencil drawn across their eyes. They say that he fought nine times with Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk, and was sometimes victorious and was sometimes defeated. He ruled for five and twenty years and then passed away.

AN ACCOUNT OF 'ALĪ 'ĀDIL KHĀN, SON OF IBRĀHĪM

In accordance with³ the directions of his father, he sat in the latter's place. He had two brothers Tahmāsp and Ismā'il. He,

Nizām-ud-dīn says very little about the events of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh's reign, except that he had nine campaigns against Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk. His account is mainly connected with the disputed succession. As regards this also, there are some discrepancies between his account and that of Firishtah. The man whom he called اسعد خان Asa'd Khān, is called سعيد خان Sa'id Khān by Firishtah. He says nothing about the disputes about the succession having taken place while the rival claimants were in a hostile country, Gōlkonda, and the statement that Mallū Khān ruled for half a day is of course incorrect. The younger brother of Mallū Khān, who is called الع خان, Ulugh Khān in the MSS of the Tabaqāt is called الو خان, Aluf Khān in the lith ed of Firishtah, and Alloo Khan by Col Briggs (vol III, p 77).

Firishtah's account of Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh's reign extends to about eight pages of the lith ed and to about thirty-three pages of Col Briggs's translation.

¹ In the text-edition یک و نیم روز

² In the text edition بلکانو Balkānu, in place of Malkapūr

³ This is not correct. Ibrāhīm, who had contrary to the example of his father and grandfather adopted the *Sunnī* doctrines was displeased with 'Alī, who had shown his preference for the Shī'a faith, and kept him confined in the fort of Mirich, and wanted to make his son Tahmāsp his successor, but he found that the latter had also become a Shī'a and he confined him in another fortress. He left the question of his successor to be decided by God. Muhammad Kishwari Khān wrote to the Superintendent of Mirich that the death of Ibrāhīm was close at hand, and he (Kishwari Khān) was proceeding to Mirich to support Shāhzāda 'Alī. As the partisans of Tahmāsp were likely to create a disturbance he should raise the umbrella of rule over the head of

also following ¹ the example of his father had the pencil drawn across the eyes of both of them. He was a man of (good) morals and prepossessing manners and had the qualities of liberality and patience and generosity. Every year he gave five or six *lakhs* of *huns* in charity to *faqirs* and the needy and travellers from foreign lands. He brought that most learned man of the age Amir Fath ul lah Shirazi from Persia having sent him a large sum of money (to induce him to come to India) and made him his *takid*. A large number of the wise men of the age were members of his court. He was a man with the nature of a *darwish* and was a friend of *faqirs*. He had a great knowledge of the language of the *sufis*. The greater part of his time was spent in the society and company of wise men. He was also obsessed with outward appearance and having collected many *amirs* round him kept them arrayed in grand dresses. ² This had a great effect on his affairs. He took possession of the districts of ³ Baikala and Baslar and Balkor and his rule extended beyond that of his ancestors. He waged war three times with Husain Nizām ul mulk and was sometimes victorious and was sometimes vanquished.

He had relations of sincere attachment to the world protecting threshold of His Majesty the *Khalifa* ilahi. He always made himself mentioned in the sanctified court by sending petitions and highly befitting tribute. Hakim Ain ul mulk came once and Hakim Ali came a second time on embassy to him from the threshold which was the asylum of all the people. He went forward twelve *karohs*

Ali and send him out of the fort so that they might march together to Bijāpur. The Superintendent of Mirich Sikandar Khān who was a strong partisan of Ali agreed to this. He was made *sipah salar* (Commander in chief) and his son in law Kamal Khān was made an *amir*. Nobles and people flocked to him from all sides and he was raised to the throne.

¹ The readings are slightly different. The MSS appear to have نسب and نر and the lith ed has نر نسب. The MSS appear to be incorrect. I cannot find any mention of the two brothers being blinded in Firishtah.

² روپے rupees in text.

³ The meaning of this is not quite clear.

⁴ I have not been able to identify these territories. In the text edition باوکلا و باسلر و بالکور.

to meet them and performed the ceremony of submission and allegiance. He inserted the great name of His Majesty the Khalifa - Ilāhī in the public prayers, and the coins of his realm. He was inclined to the Imāmīa religion and abandoned the custom of his ancestors.

He heard by accident that Malik Barīd the ruler of Bidar had ¹ a very handsome eunuch. He sent letters and demanded the eunuch. Malik Barīd evaded (sending him) by pretexts and objections. At last Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk sent an army to attack Barīd. The latter shut himself up, and made an appeal for help to 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh. He sent ten thousand horse-men to reinforce Amīr Barīd's army, and freed the latter from the siege. This time Malik Barīd being helpless and having no other alternatives sent the eunuch 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh owing to his great ² passion went out to meet the eunuch, and took him to his palace. At night he took him to a private place and attempted to have intercourse with him. The eunuch drew out a dagger from ³ (ساق shank of) his sock, and stabbed him with it in his chest, and slew him. This strange affair took place in the year 988 A H.

The period of his rule was twenty-five years. It is a strange coincidence that ⁴ three 'Ādil Khāns in succession each ruled for twenty-five years.

¹ Col. Buggs says (see note, page 142, vol. III, of his history) that "The cause of the King's death is most disgusting and offensive, and it is by no means attempted to be palliated by Ferishta, when he mentions it. A modern author of the history of Beejapoor, however, has set forth reasons in defence of Ally Adil Shah's conduct, and endeavoured to prove that Ferishta has traduced his memory." I have not been able to ascertain the name of the author referred to.

² The word is شهوت (lust) in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and شوق (curiosity, affection) in the other. In the text-edition شهوتی.

³ The word is شان in both MSS., شاح in the lith. ed. and ساق in the text-edition.

⁴ This does not appear to be quite correct. Nizām-ud-dīn of course mentions 25 years as the periods of the reigns of Ismā'il 'Ādil Shāh, Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh and 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh, but according to Ferishta Ismā'il reigned from 915 A H. to 941 A H., about twenty six years. Then Mallū reigned for six months, after which Ibrāhīm reigned from 941-965 A H., which according to Ferishta was a period of twenty-four years and six months, and 'Alī 'Ādil

AN ACCOUNT OF IBRAHĪM ĀDIL KHĀN (SON OF TAHMASP)
WHO WAS A NEPHEW OF ALI ĀDIL KHĀN

¹ Ibrahim Ādil Khān was placed on the seat of government at the age of nine years by the exertions of Kamāl Khān Kishwar Khān who

Shah from 966 to 987 A H which only gives twenty two years but if the correct date of his death was 988 then he reigned for twenty three years Mr Sewell's table has Isma'il from 1534 A D Mallu or Malu as he calls him from August 1534 to February 1535 Ibrahim from 1535-1537 A D and Ali from 1537 to April 11th 1580 (page 408)

¹ The account of the rise and fall of different ministers or regents agrees generally with that given by Firishtah According to him Kamāl Khān at first acted with moderation but after two months he became intoxicated with power and showed some disrespect to Chand Bibī who got Hājī Kishwar Khān to effect his destruction Hājī Kishwar Khān in his turn tried to grasp the whole power of the state At this time Bahzād ul mulk *arnāuba* of Murtada Nizam Shah advanced with fifteen thousand horsemen to conquer some of the districts of Bijapūr lying near the border Hājī Kishwar Khān sent an army to meet him and he was signally defeated There were great rejoicings and valuable presents were made to the *amirs* but later they were directed to return the elephants which had been given to them to the royal *fulkhana* This order which was passed without consulting Chand Bibī or Chānd Sultan as Firishtah calls her gave much displeasure and a conspiracy was made to effect the destruction of Hājī Kishwar Khān and to raise Murtada Khān to power Hājī Kishwar Khān hearing of this got Mirza Nur ud din Muhammad who had received many favours from Mustafa Khān treacherously to assassinate him Chānd Bibī was highly incensed at this but Hājī Kishwar Khān got an order from the King for imprisoning her in the fort of Satara and she was forced out of the harem with much indignity and sent to Satara After this Hājī Kishwar Khān became very unpopular and went away to Ahmadnagar but he found that the court there could not protect him so he went away towards Golkonda where he was assassinated soon after by a relative of Mustafa Khān.

After this according to Firishtah Ikhla Khān became the regent and Chand Bibī was brought back from Satara He however being suspicious that Afzal Khān Shirāzi and Rasū Pandit who were associated with him in the government would prove hostile to him had them put to death He banished other great *amirs* and in conjunction with Hamid Khān and Dilawar Khān carried on the government according to his own wishes He then invited Ain ul mulk from his *yagīr* and he and Hamid Khān and Dilawar Khān went out of the city to meet him Ain ul mulk treacherously seized them put fetters on them and brought them back to the city On his arrival near the fort he found the gates closed and being panic struck he went back to his *yagīr*

was one of the great *amīrs* slew Kāmil Khān, and became himself the *valīl*. He and Mustāfa Khān and the latter's children were then put to death, and the *valālat* fell to Dilāwar Khān Habshī. He, *i.e.*, Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān abolished the Imāmīa form of the religion, and established the religion of the *sunnat* and *jama'at*. Dilāwar ran the government with great power and strength for nine years. Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān with the help of the other *amīrs* then attacked

—
leaving Ikhlās Khān, Hamīd Khān and Dilāwar Khān behind, who then resumed their authority.

Owing to these disorders, the other rulers of the Deccan, *viz.*, Muhammad Qutb Shāh, who had succeeded his father and Bahzād ul-mulk, with Sayyid Murtada the Amīr ul umrū of Berūr invaded Bijāpūr, and laid siege to Shāhdurd. They were unable to take it, as it was strenuously defended by the *thānūdar* Muhammad Āqā and then advanced to Bijāpūr plundering and ravaging the country through which they passed. Ikhlās Khān and the Habshīs attempted to defend Bijāpūr, but being unable to do so, and knowing that their rule was not acceptable to the *amīrs*, represented the fact to Chānd Bibī. She thereupon made Shāh Abul Hasan, son of Shāh Tāhīr the *amīr jumla*. The latter reconciled the nobles, and the enemies finding it difficult to seize the city, retired to their own countries, the Nizām Shāhīs going back to Ahmadnagar, and Muhammad Qulī Qutb Shāh to Gōlkonda, but the latter left Amīr Sayyid Z'ām-ul Astarābādī on whom he conferred the title of Mustāfa Khān, to plunder the country. Upon this Ikhlās Khān sent Dilāwar Khān to attack him, and he defeated him signally, and obtained much plunder. From the hour of his victory, the idea of becoming the regent entered the mind of Dilāwar Khān. He returned towards Bijāpūr, and encamped at the town of Alāpūr. He flattered and deceived Ikhlās Khān and then marching rapidly took possession of the citadel. Ikhlās Khān tried to storm it, but was defeated, and his partisans were killed by the cannon fired from the citadel, and he had to retire in the evening. He then nominated Dalīl Khān to besiege the citadel, and he continued the siege for four months, after which he went over to Dilāwar Khān. Ikhlās Khān disdaining to escape was seized in his house, and was blinded and imprisoned.

Dilāwar Khān continued to be the regent till 998 A.H., when Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh succeeded in wresting the power from him. He effected his escape to Ahmadnagar. He was induced by Burhān Nizām Shāh to march towards Bijāpūr. After this Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh invited Dilāwar Khān to come back, and the latter did so after receiving an assurance, that he would not be injured in life and property. He was, however, after his arrival, blinded, and was imprisoned in the fortress of Satāra.

This again is a long note but I have thought it proper to write it in order to clear up the accounts of the changes in the regency.

Dilawar Khan and the latter fled to Burhan Nizam ul mulk at Ahmadnagar. He instigated the latter to march towards Bijapur and attack Adil Khan but he was unable to do anything and went back. Ibrahim Adil Khan then sent *qaul* (probably an agree-ment of safe conduct) and summoned Dilawar Khan and made him blind by drawing the pencil across his eyes. Up to this day which is in the year 1002 A H and which amounts to a period of fourteen years he (Ibrahim Adil Khan) is ruling his ¹ kingdom.

SECTION IV THE QUTB UL MULKIYA LINE OR DYNASTY

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN QULI QUTB UL MULK ² HAMADANI

He is from the tribe of ⁴ Mir Ali Shahr Ali Quyunli. He was one of the five *ta'irs* of the Bahmani Sultans. As Sultan Mahmud

¹ This is the end of the history of the Adil Shahi dynasty in one MS and in the lith ed but in the other MS there is a short interpolation which says that Ibrahim Adil Shah reigned altogether for forty eight years and a few months and died on the 11th Muharram 1037 A H and that after his death Sultan Muhammad Adil Shah ascended the throne. Firishtah's history of the Adil Shahi dynasty ends somewhat abruptly with the year 1005 A H. Col Briggs in a note on page 188 of vol III of his history says Firishtah continued to write his history as late as 1612 sixteen years after this period and probably intended to finish that of Beejapoor last which can alone account for his leaving off so abruptly.

It may be mentioned that Firishtah's account of this reign is very prolix and extends over forty four pages of the lith ed. It is in more high flown language than is usual even with him.

This heading occurs in both MSS but is not to be found in the lith ed.

² The word *اسب* occurs after *همدانی* in both MSS but it is not in the lith ed. I do not think it necessary to insert it.

⁴ The name is doubtful. It is *سکر اف* in one MS and *سکران* in the other. In the lith ed it is *سکر علی علی سکر اف*. Firishtah however says that a detailed history of the Qutb Shahi line was written by a man of the name of Shah Khur Shah but he (Firishtah) was unable to get hold of a copy of it. Col Briggs says that he was able some years ago to procure a work entitled the History of Mahomed Kooly Kootb Shah written about the time that Firishtah lived. From Col Briggs's translation of that work the name of the tribe

showed great favour to his slaves. Sultān Qulī sold himself to him, and became one of his slaves. He took possessions of the country of Gōlkonda and ruled for twenty-four years and passed away.

¹AN ACCOUNT OF JAMSHĪD QUTB-UL-MULK SON OF SULTĀN QULĪ

After his father, he sat in the latter's place, and ruled for seven years.

appears to be Ak Koovinloo so that the correct name of the tribe may be اڻ ڪوڀيلو. It appears however from the quotation of Sultān Qulī Qutb's own words in Col Briggs's work, vol. III, page 340 *et seq* that the Sultān belonged to the Kurra Kooimlo tribe, who were subjugated by the Ak Kooimloo tribe, and he fled in his childhood, with his uncle Ameer Alla Koolly, and came to the Deccan. He returned however to Hamadan with his uncle, as he was then too young to remain alone in the country. He came back however later again with his uncle but the uncle went away, and he remained under the special protection of Sultān Mahmūd Bahmanī. He defended the latter with great gallantry, when he was attacked in the fort of Ahmadābād Bidar, and after the campaign against Malik Dīnār Habshī he was made governor of Talingāna. Later he fought bravely in Mahmūd Shāh's campaign against the rebel Bahādur Gīlānī. After the death of Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī on the 24th Dhī-hijja, 912 A H, May 12th, 1507 A D, he with the five other Deccan chiefs, threw off the small portion of allegiance, which they had up to that time owed to the Bahmanī Sultāns. He was killed by Mīr Mahmūd Hamadānī, governor of Gōlkonda, when he was sitting down at prayer, at the instigation of his third son Jamshīd Qutb Shāh on the 2nd Jamādī-us s̄anī 940 A H, 4th September, 1543. These latter facts are taken from Col Briggs's account. According to Firishtah he was killed by a Turkī slave in 950 A H, when he was looking at some jewels. The slave had been instigated by Jamshīd Qutb Shāh with the promise of being made a great *amīr*, but he was slain by Jamshīd, immediately after he had slain Sultān Qulī Qutb Shāh, so that he might not divulge his complicity in the crime. It is difficult to say exactly how long Qulī Qutb Shāh ruled as an independent prince. According to Mr Sewell's table (p. 410) he reigned for thirty-one years from 1512 to 1543 A D.

¹ It is difficult to find the correct history of this reign. Nizām-ud-dīn gives no account at all, and the histories given by Firishtah, and Col Briggs differ. The former says Shāh Tāhīr was sent by Burhān Nizām-ul-mulk to congratulate Jamshīd on his accession. Shāh Tāhīr incited him to join Burhān Nizām Shāh to attack Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Shāh. He accordingly invaded the latter's territory, and built a fort in *pargana* Kāknī, and then advanced to attack the fort of Atgar. In the meantime 'Ādil Shāh made peace with Nizām Shāh.

1. AN ACCOUNT OF IBRAHIM QUTB UL MULK SON OF SULTAN QULI

After his brother Ibrahim became the ruler of Golkonda He was a man of affairs and of wisdom But anger and wrath obsessed him

and Rām Raj and Nizām Shāh went back to Ahmadnagar Adil Shāh then sent Asa d *Ikhān Lārī* to attack Jamshud Quṭb Shāh Asa d *Ikhān Lārī* first seized the fort of Kāhāl and compelled Jamshud Quṭb Shāh to raise the siege of Atgar After that Jamshud Quṭb Shāh had several campaigns with Asa d *Ikhān Lārī* in each of which he was defeated and in the last of these in a hand to hand fight with Asa d *Ikhān Lārī* one side of his face was severed off by a blow of his opponents sword After that he made peace with Adil Shāh and conquered some parts of Kachit Then he was ill for two years and now became very savage and ordered people to be put to death or imprisoned for slight offences A conspiracy was then formed to depose him and place one of his brothers on the throne He received information of this plot and imprisoned his brothers Haider and Ibrahim The former died soon after and the latter went away to Bijānagar Jamshud died of a high fever in 9 A H

Col Briggs's account which is probably derived from the work he got hold of (see note 1 p 164) is entirely different except that he agrees in saying that Jamshud Quṭb Shah died in 90 A H I do not however consider it necessary to give a summary of his account as it can be referred to by anybody who is interested in the history

1 Nizām ud din gives no account of the reign of Ibrāhīm Quṭb Shah He only mentions a few of the traits of his character As far as this goes he agrees with Firishtah who mentions the same traits with some more details for instance Firishtah says that the nails which had been shown to him were the nails of the toes of his victims which were severed by being beaten with sticks (*taziyana*) As regards his servants eating at his table he says that it was the special servants (*naulāran Ḥāsa*) who had this privilege Firishtah also says that he freed Talingāna from highway robbers so that merchants and wealthy people could travel from place to place in safety

As regards the history of his reign Firishtah says that he sought an asylum with Rām Raj during the reign of Jamshud Quṭb Shah After the latter's death the ministers placed his son who was an infant of two years of age on the throne but the Dakinis attacked the palace Then the ministers determined to send for Ibrahim Quṭb ul mulk and to place him on the throne They obtained permission from Rām Raj for bringing him to Golkonda and when he came to the border of Bijānagar Muṣṭafa hastened to receive him and he was made *amir jumla* or Prime Minister

After this he in concert with Husain Nizām Shah invaded Bijpūr in 960 A H and laid siege to Gulbarga But he was afraid of increasing the power of Husain Nizām Shāh and went back to Golkonda and Husain Nizām Shāh

For a very small offence he inflicted strange punishments on the servants of God. He ordered that the nails of his victims should be severed from their fingers, and should be brought before him in a vessel. Much food was brought, every day, to his table, and it had been so determined that all his servants should eat at his table. He indulged in much ceremony in his meals.

He reigned for five and thirty years.

being unable to carry on the siege alone, retired to Ahmadnagar. Afterwards Ādil Shāh and Rām Rāj invaded the Nizām Shāhī territory, and at their request, and somewhat against his will Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh joined them, and they laid siege to Ahmadnagar. They were about to take it, when Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh left at midnight, and retired in precipitation to Gōlkonda, and Rām Rāj and Ādil Shāh had also to raise the siege.

After that Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh asked for the hand of Husain Nizām Shāh's daughter, and at the latter's request he agreed in concert with him to lay siege to Kāhān. There the marriage feast was celebrated and the siege was begun. Then Ādil Shāh and Rām Rāj and Tufāl Khān and Amīr Barīd advanced against them, when Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh retired to Gōlkonda, and Husain Nizām Shāh to Ahmadnagar, hotly pursued by Ādil Shāh and Rām Rāj. They laid waste both the Ahmadnagar and the Gōlkonda territories, but peace was at last concluded, and Rām Rāj and Ādil Shāh retired to their own territories. Afterwards Murtada Nizām Shāh summoned Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh to come and aid him in besieging the fort of Dārūr, belonging to Ādil Shāh, but before he could arrive the fort was taken. He however joined Murtada Nizām Shāh in the invasion of Bijāpūr. Ādil Shāh now sent to Murtada Nizām Shāh a letter, which Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh had written to him, about acting in concert with him. Nizām Shāh became suspicious of Qutb Shāh's fidelity, and Qutb Shāh retiring in all haste to Gōlkonda, Nizām Shāh looted his camp, and pursued his army, and took much booty and slew large numbers of his men. 'Abd-ul-qādir, the eldest son of Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh then represented to his father, that if he received permission to do so, he would at once attack the Nizām Shāhī army and defeat it. Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh became suspicious of his son's motives, and imprisoned him in a fort, and afterwards caused his death, by giving him a poisoned drink. Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh died in the year 989 A H. He had ruled for thirty-two years.

Col Briggs's account (vol III, p 390) is slightly different. He has a separate section for Soobhan Kooly Kooth Shah, the infant son of Jamsheed, who, he says, was seven years of age, when he was elevated to the throne. Then as regards Ibrahim Kootb Shah, he says that in the latter part of his reign he conquered some territories in Orissa. According to Col Briggs, Ibrahim Kootb Shah died on the 21st Rubbee-oos Sany 988 A H, 2nd June, 1580. Mr Sewell (p 410) has 1581.

AN ACCOUNT OF MUHAMMAD QUTB UL MUHI SON OF IBRAHIM

Muhammad Qutb succeeded his father. He became the lover of a prostitute of the name of Bhaginatti and having laid the foundation of a city called it Bhagnagar. He had one thousand horsemen as the retainers of that woman and they always attended at her stirrups. He is ruling the country up to the present day which is in the year 1002 A.H. and in the 38th year of the Hahira i.e. for a period of nine years.

Nizam ud din does not give any account of the events of the reign and merely refers to a scandalous matter of a more or less personal nature. According to Firishlah Muhammad Qutb Shah was the eldest and best of the three surviving sons of Jain ul Qutb Shah. He succeeded the latter in his 15th year. He married a daughter of Shah Mirza Isfahan.

He entered into a treaty with Nizam Shah and invaded the Bijapur territory and besieged Shah Darg but being unable to take it went to Bijapur and laid siege to it. They were however unable to take it also and Muhammad Qutb Shah was about to retire to Chikoli when the commander of the Nizam Shahi army becoming aware of this sent him a message that he should go himself towards Ahmadnagar leaving waste the Ahil Shahi country through which he would pass and Muhammad Qutb Shah should proceed to besiege Hasanabad Gulbarga. They accordingly did so but when Muhammad Qutb Shah arrived near Hasanabad Gulbarga he left seven thousand horsemen and many elephants under Mu'ajza Khan to carry on the siege and himself hastened back to his capital. Mu'ajza Khan laid waste the country round Hasanabad Gulbarga but Dilavar Khan was sent with a large army from Bijapur and he defeated Mu'ajza Khan who retired in great haste to the borders of Tilang.

After this Firishlah refers to Bhaginatti and he also refers to the building of the new city but he says that it was necessary to do so because Gikonda had become extremely unhealthy. He afterwards changed the name of the new city of Haidarabad.

Muhammad Qutb Shah resolved after this to conquer Dang by which Firishlah means the country lying between Tilang and Bang or Bengal i.e. Orissa. He conquered a great part of the country and the ruler of it who was called Bala Balandar fled in great distress to the furthest part of the country.

The above is the history down to 101 A.H. It is not necessary to go any further especially as Firishlah says nothing further about the history but indulges in a description of certain matters connected with the Sultan.

One MS. calls her a ريان نابری the other simply ريان, while the lith. ed. has only نابری. In the text edition the name is بهگ معنی.

SECTION V ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF GUJRĀT

From the beginning of the year 783 to the year 970 A H , when (Gujrāt) came into the possession of the officers of His Majesty the Khalīfa -i-Ilāhī, which is a period of 187 years fifteen persons ruled over the country (These are the) particulars (of them)

Sultān Muhammad, son of Sultān Muzaffar, two months and a few days,

Sultān Muzaffar ¹Shāh three years and eight months and twenty days

Sultān 2 Ahmad thirty-two years and six months and twenty days

Sultān Muhammad son of Ahmad, seven years and four months .

Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh, seven years and six ³ months
and thirteen days

Dāūd Shāh, seven days

Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, fifty-five years and eleven months and
⁴ two days

Sultān Muzaḥḥar son of Mahmūd fourteen years and nine months

Sultān Sikandar, two months and sixteen days

Sultān Mahmūd, four months

Sultān Bahādur, eleven years and eleven months,

Sultān Muhammad Shāh one and half month

Sultān Mahmūd, son of ⁵ Latīf Khān, eighteen years and a few days

¹ The word Shāh is in one MS and in the lith ed but not in the other MS. The period is 3 years 8 months and 20 days in one MS but is 3 years and 8 months and 8 days in the lith ed. It may be either 8 or 20 days in the other MS.

² One MS inserts *علا* after the name

³ The words وَوَدَّعَافًا which occur in both MSS are omitted from the lith ed. I have inserted them

⁴ The words **وَوَدَّ** which occur in one MS and in the lith ed are not to be found in the other MS

⁵ He is called Latif Khān in both MSS, but Latif Shāh in the lith. ed. The period is 18 years in both MSS and 16 years in the lith. ed. I have adopted the reading in the MSS.

Sultan Ahmad three years and a few months and

Sultan Muzaffar son of ¹ Mahmud sixteen years and some months

(AN ACCOUNT OF) ĀZAM HUMAYUN ZAFAR KHAN

It is written in books of history that when the (accounts of the) tyranny of Nizam Mufarrāh who bore the title of Āshī Khān and who had the government of Gujrat in his hands under Sultan Muhammad son of Sultan Firuz Shah spread over the regions of the world and the oppressed who had suffered from his tyranny and the victims of his cruelty arrived in the capital city of Dehli from the country of Gujrat with their complaints and narrated tales of his tyranny and oppression before Sultan Muhammad Shah and spoke the truth of his violence and insubordination the Sultan after much consideration and great deliberation conferred the fief of Gujrat on Āzam Humayun Zafar Khān son of Wajih ul mulk who was one of the great *amirs* after bestowing many royal favours on him On the 3rd Rabi ul awwal in the year 783 A H he conferred on him a (royal) umbrella and a red pavilion which are specially reserved for *badshahs* and granted him permission to go to Gujrat Zafar Khān started from the city the same day and encamped at the royal reservoir (*haud* : *ḥas*) On the 4th of the month Sultan Muhammad hastened to Zafar Khān's camp and made his ears heavy with the pearls of advice and after again conferring on him a special robe of honour retired to the city

They say that when the *ta'irs* wrote the order of his appointment they under the orders of the Sultan left the place where the

¹ One MS has Shāh after Mahmud but neither the other MS nor the lith ed has it

Firishtah does not give him the title of Āshī Khān but calls him Farhat ul mulk otherwise called Nī'm Mufarrāh Firishtah does not speak much of his tyranny but he says that he had the intention of hostility (to the emperor) and therefore treated the *amīndars* and the infidels of the country well and in order to flatter them gave currency to the customs of heathenism and idolatry Therefore the learned and erudite men of Gujrat sent the letter in which they spoke of Nī'm Mufarrāh's misdeeds and prayed the Sultān to take necessary steps for remedying them

titles (of the new Governor) should have been written, blank, and he (i.e., the Sultān) wrote the titles with his own hand and they were as follows ¹ "My brother Majlis 'Alī (the noble courtier), the honoured Khān learned just generous, energetic, the most fortunate of the faith and religion the defender of Islām and Musalmāns, the binder of the *saltanat* the supporter of the faith,

¹ It is rather difficult to understand these lofty titles and to find equivalents for the high flown epithets Firishtah who in many places copies the Tabaqāt almost *verbatim* gives them as *برادر من مجلس علی حاکم عادل دادل*

محمد سعید الملہ والدین ظہیر الاسلام و الامین عصمہ الساطات ہمیں الملک جامع الکفرۃ و المشرکین فالح العصرۃ و المہر دین و طیب سماء المعالی بحکم ملک الاعالی صعد در در و عا تہمتن قلعة کثا کورگیر آصف تدبیر صابط امور ناظم مصالح مہرور - دی الیامس و السعادات صاہ الرای و الکفایات ناصر العدل و الاحسان دستور صاہنقران الع و قلق احام *

The antecedents of Zafar Khān are rather curious. It appears from Bayley's History of Gujarāt, p. 68, *et seq* that Fīrōz, who was a great hunter, went out in pursuit of deer one day, and became separated from his attendants. He came to a village which was one of the dependencies of Thānūsai. Outside the village he found a party of land-holders seated and dismounting from his horse, asked one of them to pull off his boots. This man was a master of the science of interpreting signs and appearances. He found on the sole of the Sultān's foot, marks of royalty and the signs of imperial power. The chief men of the village were two brothers Sādhū and Sadhāran. For their caste and genealogy see pp. 67-68. They entertained the guest, and gave their sister, who "was peerless in beauty and loveliness" in *nikāh* to the Sultān. They shortly afterwards became Musalmāns and Sadhāran received the title of Wajih-ul-Mulk. He was the father of Zafar Khān. The Sultān was a disciple of Qutb-ul-aqtāb Hadrat Makhdūm-i-Jahāniān. Sādhū and Sadhāran and Zafar Khān also became his disciples. Zafar Khān did some service to the saint, and the latter in return gave him the country of Gujrāt. When he went back to his family, and told them what had happened they said "You are well-stricken in years and if the country of Gujarāt falls to thee, what life wilt thou have left to enjoy it?" He went back to the saint, and made offerings of perfumes, etc. The saint accepted them, and taking a handful of dates, from a plate which was before him, said "Thy seed like unto these in number shall reign over Gujarāt." Some say there were twelve, some say thirteen dates and other say eleven.

When Fīrōz Khān became the Sultān, he appointed Zafar Khān and his brother Shams Khān to the high position of *sharābdār*. Owing to this they have been described as *kalāls* or distillers.

the exterminator of *kufr* and heresy the destroyer of the false and the rebellious the Pole star of the sky of spirituality the star of the high heaven the breaker of the ranks in the day of battle a fort conquering Rustam the conqueror of kingdoms an *Asaf* in policy the regulator of affairs the director of the rule of people the master of success and good fortune the man of wisdom and success the distributor of justice and beneficence the *ra'is* of the lord of conjunction *Ulugh Qutlugh Āzam Humayun Zafar Khan*

In short (he) travelled towards Gujrat by successive marches. On the way news came to him that a son had been born to Tatar Khan his son who was the *ra'is* of Sultān Muhammad Shah and he had received the name of Ahmad Khan. Zafar Khan was greatly delighted on hearing this joyful news. He arranged a grand entertainment and conferred honours and robes on many of the soldiers. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Nagor the men of Kanbayat came to petition against Nizam Mufarrah praying for justice. Zafar Khan gave them hopes and advanced towards Nahrwala. When he arrived there which is commonly known as Pattan he wrote and sent a letter to Malik Nizam Mufarrah (in which he said) that it had been mentioned in the august presence of Muhammad Shah that Malik Nizam Mufarrah had spent the revenue of a number of years of the *khalsa* lands of the Sultān for his own needs and purposes and had not remitted one *dinar* to the treasury. It had likewise (been reported) that he had stretched out his hands for tyranny and oppression and had greatly harassed the common people living in these places so that men had repeatedly come to Dehli with supplications and complaints. (He went on to say) that as the reins of binding and loosening of all state affairs of the neighbourhood had been placed in his hands the better way would be that whatever might still be left of the revenue of the *khalsa* lands for those years should be sent with all promptitude before he went himself and after comforting and cheering the oppressed he should himself proceed to the metropolis of Dehli.

¹ Firishtah does not say that Zafar Khan wrote to Nizam Mufarrah after arriving at Nahrwala Pattan.

Malik Nizām Mufarrah sent a ¹ reply to this effect — ‘ You have come a long way, you should remain where you are and should not take the trouble (to advance further) — I shall go there and render an account — but on this condition that you will not make me over to custodians ’ When this reply came and the fact of his rebellion and violence became certain, Azam Humāyūn Zafar Khān began to arrange his army. After a few days news came that Malik Nizām Mufarrah had turned towards that country with a large force, and was advancing by successive marches. Azam Humāyūn sallied out of the city of Pattan with his well-equipped army, with the intention to give battle. A great battle was fought on the 7th of Safar in the year 794 in the village of ² Kānthū which is twelve *karōhs* from Pattan. Malik Nizām Mufarrah went about searching for Zafar Khān accompanied by a select body of troops, and he ran about in all directions, like an ordinance of heaven (?) At this time a man belonging to Zafar Khān’s army having vanquished him (apparently in single combat) inflicted on him a severe wound, and he fell off from his horse on to the ground. The man immediately ³ cut off his head, and brought it to Zafar Khān.

⁴ Couplets

When Death into his blood plunged his hand,
Fate his clear seeing eyes did close
When the key of victory is not in one’s hand,
He cannot with his arm, the door of victory break

On seeing what had happened, defeat fell on the army of Nizām Mufarrah. Large numbers of men were slain, and much booty fell into the hands (of the victorious army). Zafar Khān went in pursuit.

¹ Firishtah also says that the tenor of the reply was what it is described in the text.

² The place is called کاتھو Kānho and کانتھو Kānthu in the MS and کانبھ Kānbha in the lith. ed. It is کانتھو Kānthū in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col. Briggs calls it Jitpui. Bayley calls it Kambhu کانبھو in the text edition.

³ Firishtah’s account of the engagement is different. It is figurative and vague. He says that بعد از استعمال آلات حرب و ضرب آفتاب بصوب و ضروری ار افق به — ار — مد ظہر حال ہاوع نمودہ نظام معرج بقصد تھمس بدہوالہ گریخت. It does not mention what happened to Nizām Mufarrah after he had fled.

⁴ The first couplet is not in the lith. ed., but it is in both the MSS.

for some distance and then returned to the neighbourhood of Pattan and sent his agents to all the *parganas*. In the year 795 A.H. he advanced with the object of punishing the rebels who had raised the dust of disturbance in the neighbourhood of ¹ Kanbayat. He cleansed that country from the weeds and thorns of the insurgents. He laid the ointment of his kindness and favour on the hearts which had been wounded by the dagger of the tyranny of Nizam Mufarrak. He then advanced towards Asawal. He remained there for some days and having pleased the common people and all the inhabitants earned their gratitude and came back to the neighbourhood of Pattan.

In the year 796 A.H. news came that Sultan Muhammad Shah son of Sultan Iruz had accepted the summons of the just God in the metropolitan city of D hli and the affairs of the empire had fallen into confusion and most of the *zamindars* had taken up an attitude of insurrection more specially ³ the Raja of Idar who had placed his foot outside the circle of obedience and fealty. Zafar Khan equipped an army and advanced by rapid marches with a large force and elephants of the size of mountains to punish the Raja. As he came with great quickness and proceeded to lay siege ⁴ the Raja had no time whatever to arrange for his defence. He was therefore compelled to shut himself up and the victorious troops having overrun the country of Idar stretched their hands for plunder and rapine. They raised to the ground every temple which they found. In a very short time there was such scarcity and famine in the fort that the ⁵ Raja of Idar sent his *vakils* in great humility

¹ One MS. has *روح* but the other and the lith. ed. have *کتاب*.

Firishtah says with reference to Asawal *که الآن احمد آباد آ جا و اس* i.e. that at present Ahmadabad is situated in its place. It will be seen from the accounts of the reign of Ahmad Shah that he built the city of Ahmadabad near Asawal.

³ According to Firishtah he had formerly borne allegiance to the rulers of Gujrat but had now laid the foundation of shamlessness and had withdrawn his head from the yoke of dependence.

⁴ Firishtah says that there were several severe battles and Zafar Khan was victorious each time.

⁵ According to Firishtah the Raja sent his eldest son with some others to sue for quarter.

and piteousness, and prayed for forgiveness of his offences. Zafar Khān took such tributes from him as he wanted, and advanced towards Sōmnāth.

At this time intelligence came that ¹ Malīk Naṣir Rāja celebrated as 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asīr, had stretched his foot of pride beyond the blanket of his status, and had harassed some of the villages of Nadarbār. A'zam Humāyūn, knowing that the protection of his own territory was more incumbent on him than the capture of the temple of Sōmnāth, advanced towards Nadarbār by rapid marches. 'Ādil Khān hearing this news returned to his own country. Zafar Khān also returned to his headquarters at Pattan, after showing kindness to the inhabitants of the country.

In the year 797 A.H., he again mustered his troops, and determined to invade ² Jai and Tar which are situated to the west of Pattan, and after overrunning some places and getting tributes from the headman of that locality, advanced from there, with the purpose of destroying the temple of Sōmnāth. On the way he made the Rājput's food for his merciless sword, and wherever a temple appeared before his eyes, he raised and destroyed it.

When he arrived at Sōmnāth he burnt the temple down and broke up the idol. He slew the *lāfirs*, and plundered the city. He planned the erection of a *Jāma' masjid*, and having appointed the right men as directed by the *shara'*, and leaving a *thāna* (military post) there, retraced his steps towards Pattan.

In the year 799, news came to A'zam Humāyūn that the Rājput's of ³ Mandalgarh had acquired such power, that the Musalmāns there were abandoning their country and leaving their homes, on account of the injuries caused to them. Zafar Khān collected the

¹ Firishtah describes him as the ancestor of the Farūqī the rulers of Burhānpur.

² The names are written as حرتر in one MS but the حرتر may be a mistake for حر دتر which is required having been omitted by mistake. In the other MS and in the lith. ed. the names are حر و تر. Firishtah calls the place حر د and the ruler of it دای. In the text edition it is حر د.

³ It is Mandalgarh in the MSS and Karnāl in the lith. ed. Karnāl or Garnāl or Gurnār is the same as حرنا گده Jūnāgarh. Firishtah also has مددل گده.

army of Gujrat and by successive rapid marches traversed the forests and deserts of that country. The Raja of the place being proud of the strength of his fortification occupied himself in defending it. The victorious troops surrounded the hill and the fort like the centre of a circle and placed *manjanīqs* (battering ram or catapults) on all sides and every day a number of Rajputs were slain. But as the fort was so strong that they were unable to accomplish their object by the help of the catapults Zafar Khān ordered that *sabats* (covered ways) should be planned and completed with all speed. But in spite of these the fort could not be taken. In the end after the siege had lasted for a year and some months the Rajputs in great humility asked for quarter and men and women came with bared heads and prayed for safety. They agreed to pay tributes and promised that it should be sent every year to Pattan without any demand being made for it. They also agreed that hence forward they would not cause any kind of injury to the Musalmans.

Azam Humayun owing to his innate kindness and natural generosity accepted their excuses and gave them quarter. He took tribute from them and having fixed the amounts of the annual tribute and having assured himself about the safety of that territory he hastened to perform a pilgrimage to the holy tomb of the Shaikh of the path of the Faith ¹ Khwajah Mu'in ud din Hasan Sanjari. He pillaged and plundered the towns in that country and left no trace of cultivation and habitation. After finishing this invasion he moved to the country known as Dandwana and having plundered

Dilwara and Jalwara took a large number of prisoners and much booty. ² He returned to Pattan on the 17th of Ramadan in the year 800 A.H. As these campaigns had extended over three years Azam Humayun issued an order that all his troops and soldiery

¹ Of Ajmir

² Dilwāra دلوارہ in one MS. and Dilwara and Jalwāra دلوارہ و حلوارہ in the other and Danduana in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Dilwāra and Jalwāra. He does not mention Dandwana at all.

³ Firishtah says that it appears from the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi* that at this time Zafar Khān had the *Khubba* read in his own name and assumed the title of Muzaḥḥar Shah.

should be exempted from all service and work of all kinds for the period of one year

Towards the end of the year 800 A H, Tātār Khān, Zafar Khān's son, who held the office of *vazīr* of Sultān Muhammad bin Firūz fled from Dehlī owing to the ¹ dominance and violence of Mallū Khān, and came to Gujrāt to his father as has been mentioned in the section about Dehlī. In short Tātār Khān came in a state of great humility with a prayer to his father that he should be allowed to take the latter's army with him, and have his revenge over ² Mallū Khān. A'zam Humāyūn Zafar Khān was thinking of collecting troops. But as Mīrzā Pīr Muhammad Khān, grandson of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction, Amīr Tamūr Gūrgān had taken possession of Multān and had seized Sārang Khān, A'zam Humāyūn deferred the carrying out of this determination and the accomplishment of this deed, inasmuch as he had learned by his acumen that Mīrzā Pīr Muhammad was the vanguard of His Majesty, the Lord of the auspicious conjunction. It so happened that after a short time, in the year 801 A H, news came that Amīr Tamūr had arrived in the neighbourhood of Dehlī with a large army. Zafar Khān comforted his son, and postponed the march to Dehlī for a suitable opportunity.

At this time they (i.e., Zafar Khān and Tātār Khān) advanced together towards Īdar. They arrived by rapid marches and besieged the fort. They sent detachments every day in different directions, and left no stone unturned in plundering and ravaging the country. The Rāja of Īdar in great humility and weakness sent emissaries, and agreed to pay tribute. As the empire of Dehlī was at this time full of disturbances and rebellion, Zafar Khān remained satisfied

¹ Firishtah briefly describes the conflicts between Mallū or Iqbāl Khān and Tātār Khān.

² He is called *بلو اقبال خان* in one MS, *امال خان* in the other, while the lith. ed. has only *بلو خان*. Firishtah does not say that Tātār Khān prayed for the help of his father's army to revenge himself on Mallū or Iqbāl Khān, but he incited his father, Muzaffar Shāh, to march to Dehlī, with the object of making himself the *bādshāh*. Muzaffar Shāh agreed, and began to collect troops, but the news came of the advance of Mīrzā Pīr Muhammad Khān, grandson of Amīr Tamūr, and upset all their plans.

with the engagement to pay tribute and returned to Pattan in Ramadan of that year. About this time an immense number of people fleeing from Dehli from the visitation of Amīr Taimur arrived in Pattan. Azam Humayun took pity on their condition according to their different predicaments and showed each one of them such kindness as his condition merited. After sometime Sultan Mahmud son of Sultan Muhammad son of Sultan Firuz Shah also fled from the Lord of the happy conjunction and came to Gujrat. Zafar Khan did not accord to him the treatment and respect that was due to him and he becoming hopeless and heart broken went away towards Malwa as is mentioned in the proper place.

In the year 803 A.H. Azam Humayun disbursed a year's pay to his soldiers and with a large force advanced to conquer Idar. When his victorious army surrounded the fort on all sides and fought battles in succession for some days the Raja evacuated the fort one night and fled towards Bijanagar. Early the next morning Zafar Khan entered the fort offered thanks to God demolished the temples left a *thana* (military post) in the fort and divided the country of Idar among his nobles. After the accomplishment of the necessary work in that country he returned to Pattan. In the year 804 A.H. (they) sent (the news) to Zafar Khan that the Hindus and *kafirs* had collected round the temple of Somnath and were exerting themselves to the utmost in reviving their ancient customs. Azam Humayun turned his attention in that direction and sent an army in advance of himself. When the inhabitants of Somnath received information of this they advanced to meet him by way of the sea and began a battle. Azam Humayun arrived there on wings of speed and routed and destroyed them. Those who escaped the sword fled and took shelter in the citadel of the port of Dip. After a few days the gates of the citadel were opened and the garrison were made food for the sword. He had the chief

¹ The reading is obscure. the MSS. have هندو و کافران and the lith. ed. has بهود و کافران. The word هندو appears to be incorrect if it was بهود then the meaning would be some Hindus and infidels. بهود in the lith. ed. is of course incorrect. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has کافران و سمرنات, i.e. the *kafirs* of Somnath. He also says that they had overpowered the military post left there by Azam Humayun.

men of that body thrown under the feet of elephants. He demolished the temples, and laid the foundation of *Iāmī'* mosque. He appointed *qādīs* and *muftīs* and other officers directed by the *shara'* and leaving a military post returned to Pattan, his capital.

In the year 806 A H Tātār Khān informed his father A'zam Humāyūn, that Mallū Khān had seized Dehlī, and in spite of the fact that Sultān Mahmūd had rested content with Qanauj, he would not leave him in that condition. He went on to say ' If an army be sent with this slave (i.e. he himself) he would advance to Dehlī wrest the city from his possession, and having revenged himself again restore his dominion to Sultān Mahmūd.' A'zam Humāyūn said in reply "At present there is no one among the descendants of Fīrūz Shāh who is capable of carrying on the duties of the empire. Mallū Iqbāl Khān is at present in possession of Dehlī, and the learned in the doctrines of the religion do not approve of dissensions and warfare leading to bloodshed among the followers of Islām." Tātār Khān was not satisfied with these words and said I have such power now that I can attain to the empire of Dehlī. Kingship and empire are not the inheritance of any one and recited the following couplet

Couplet

None can a kingdom and throne acquire,
That does not seize the sword with both his hands

When A'zam Humāyūn saw that he (Tātār Khān) was bent on this idea, he relinquished the work of the empire and made over to him all the army and the paraphernalia of sovereignty.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF THE ACCESSION OF TĀTĀR KHĀN, SON OF
A'ZAM HUMĀYŪN ZAFAR KHĀN

When Zafar Khān ² voluntarily gave up the duties of the sovereignty, Tātār Khān arranged on the 1st of Jamādī-ul-ākhīr 806 A H

¹ The heading is given differently in the MSS and in the lith ed. It is what I have in the text in one MS. In the other MS, it is the same, but the word حُلوس (accession) is omitted. In the lith ed it is دَکَر. Firishtah has no separate heading.

² According to Firishtah Zafar Khān who had assumed the title of Muzaffar Shāh had acquired such power by the conquest of Idai and Sōmnāth,

a grand entertainment in the town of Ajmal and sat on the throne of empire. He raised the umbrella over his head and assumed the title of Sultan Muhammad Shah. He conferred robes of honour on the *amirs* and the chiefs and leaders of the country. He distributed the gold that had been scattered as thank-offering on the umbrella of sovereignty among wise and meritorious men. He conferred the office of *ra'is* on Shams Khan Dindani who was the younger brother of Azam Humayun. He ordered that in the herding (*Tughra*) of the *farmān* the following words should be written: ¹ *Il Muaffaq wal Waḥīq bi-ta'id ur Rihmān ystakhr ul dunya wa'd-dīn Abul Ḥaṣṣi Muḥammad Shāh bin Mu'azzar Shāh*.

After arranging the affairs of the country, he collected a large army and on the 1st of Shaḥrūr of the afore-mentioned year he moved out of the town of Ajmal with the object of conquering Delhi. He was informed while on the march that the Raja of Nadol

that he formed the idea of seizing Delhi and making his son Tātār Khān the emperor with the title of *Chāh ud-daula wal-dīn Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh*. With this object they were marching along when at Sāmūr Muḥammad Shāh suddenly died.

Inshtah goes on to say that the real facts are that Tātār Khān rebelled against his father who had become old and weak at Ajmal and kept him imprisoned in the fort there. He made his uncle Shams Khān the *ra'is al-saltanat* and gave himself the title of *Nā'ir ud-dīn Muḥammad Shāh* and then having collected troops advanced to conquer Delhi. Sulṭān Mu'azzar sent one of his trusted men and insisted on his brother's arranging for his release and for the assassination of Muḥammad Shāh. Shams Khān attempted to dissuade him, having no other alternative killed Muḥammad Shāh by giving him poison. Bayley (p. 81 b) says: "It is commonly believed among the best informed of the people of Cajarāt that Tātār Khān conspired with certain discontented men his friends outwardly his enemies in reality and placed his father in confinement. He then seated himself on the throne with the title of Muḥammad Shāh and won over all the officials and army. Afterwards he waged war against the infidels of Nādot and subdued them. Then he directed his course towards Delhi but drank the draught of death and went to the city of non-existence. The cause of his death was this. In his ambition for the things of this life he threw aside the respect due to a father, a respect which is a lasting blessing to him who pays it, and God Almighty then sowed the seed of vengeance in the heart of his father. Whereupon some of those who were in attendance upon Tātār Khān but who were personally inclined to Zafar Khān gave him poison."

¹ الوالى only instead of المولى و المولى in the text edition

had placed his feet of pride outside the bounds of obedience and allegiance. He turned his bundle of might from the road, advanced full gallop into the country of Nādōt, and sacked and ravaged villages and towns. He then halted in the town of ¹Samūr. At this time which was the spring tide of his greatness he suddenly passed away owing to excessive drinking.

Couplet

To the dust was cast that flower of greatness, that the
garden of empire,

With a hundred thousand caresses had in its bosom
nourished

The period of his reign was two years and two months and some days. When the dreadful news reached Azam Humāyūn in the country of Bahūj he grieved ² sorely. He arrived very quickly at the camp, and sent Muhammad Shāh's body to Pattan and had his title recognised in the *farmān* as *Khudā-ī-gān Shahīd* (the martyred Lord). He showed favour to Shams Khān Dandānī, and transferring Malik Jalāl Kōkhar, made over to him the government and defence of the territory of Nāgōr. Then as there was no help for it he, with a heart broken into a hundred pieces and dazed and stunned mind, occupied himself with the affairs of state. He laid aside the royal umbrella and the throne, and did not assume any of the insignia of greatness. At last, however, acceding to the prayer of the nobles, and of the pillars of state he again sat on the throne of empire in the year 810 A.H. It has, however, come to (my) notice in various histories that Shams Khān Dandānī gave poison to Muhammad Shāh in his wine.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF ZAFAR KHĀN WHO HAD THE TITLE OF MUZAFFAR SHĀH

When the period of disturbance as regards the imperial power in the country of Gujrāt, which had extended over a period of three

¹ The name is سمنور in the MSS and in the lith ed., and also in the lith ed. of Frishtah, but Col Briggs calls the place Suntpoor. The invasion of Nādōt and the name of the place where the death took place are not mentioned by Bayley. According to him, Muhammad Shāh died on the march to Dehlī ساینور Sāinūr in the text-edition.

² One MS and the lith ed. have اودوهناک شد, but the other MS omits the word عظم.

years and four months was ended Azam Humayun Zafar Khān in accordance with the prayer of the nobles and the suggestion of the great and the wise sat on the jewelled throne in the manner of Sultans in the town of ¹ Birpūr at the moment which was selected by the astrologers who knew all the stars and assumed the title of Sultān Muzaffar Shah He was described in the *Akhuba* and *farman* as *Almalthiq balla al mannan Shams ud dunia uad din Abul Mujaḥid Mu affar Shah* The gold that was showered in thanks offering over his umbrella was distributed among meritorious persons He conferred robes of honour on nobles and men possessing the knowledge of God and the heads of various groups He then advanced by successive marches to the country of Malwa When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Dhar Sultan Hūshang advanced to give battle but as he had not the strength to withstand the onset of Muzaffar Shah's (army) ² he fled and took shelter in the fort of Dhar (but) in the end he came out and saw the Sultān It had however come to the knowledge of Muzaffar Shah that Sultān ³ Hushang had given poison to his father Dilawar Khān As there

¹ The name is Birpūr in the MSS and in Bayley In the lith ed it is پرنور Purnūr It does not appear to be mentioned in the lith ed of Firishtah or in Col Briggs

Firishtah however says that a great battle was fought between the armies of Gujrat and Malwa of which the Rustams and heroes of the world have spoken with the tongue of praise but the army of Malwa being defeated Sultan Hūshang was taken prisoner Col Briggs also says that Sultān Hushang was taken prisoner after a severe action According to Bayley (page 84) the brave warriors of Muzaffar Shāh soon scattered his ranks as a whirlwind scatters clouds and he was obliged to fly into the fortress of Dhar

³ Bayley quotes the *Tabaqāt-i Akbarī* as given in *Muhammadian History* vol IV p 36 which agrees mainly with the text and then says that Firishtah's version (which is probably impartial) is one of Not proven I have examined the passages about the death of Dilawar Khān in Firishtah in both the Gujrat and Malwa sections but I do not find anything that justifies the statement that Firishtah's version or verdict is one of not proven In the section about Gujrāt Firishtah says و چون دلاور خان والی مالوۃ فوج سده بود هوسنگ ساه نام مقام او گرد و سپهر تاب که هوسنگ بطع ملک بدر را رهزاده بکشد In the section about Malwa he says مہمان خبر آوردند کہ ساه مظفر گجراتی حسن خبر رسید کہ الہ خان بدر خود دلاور خان عزی را بواسطہ حطام دہوی ریز داده خود را

had been affection and fraternal feeling between Dilāwar Khān and Muzaffar Shāh, (when they were both) in the service of Sultān Muhammad Firūz Shāh. Muzaffar Shāh put Sultān Hūshang and some of his adherents into prison, and installed his brother ¹ Nasrat Khān in the government of Mālwa.

Intelligence came at this time, that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī had come out of Jaunpūr with the idea of seizing Dēhli. On hearing this Muzaffar Shāh started towards Dēhli. When Sultān Ibrāhīm knew that Sultān Muzaffar was coming with the intention of giving battle, he turned back from the way and returned to Jaunpūr, as the pen has narrated in the section about Jaunpūr. Sultān Muzaffar on hearing this returned from the way and came back to Gujrāt.

He took ² Sultān Hūshang with him in a state of captivity. (But) after a time the *ra'iyyats* and soldiers of Mālwa (aggrieved)

سالمان موشنگی نام نہاد So far as I know Firishtah nowhere adjudicates on the rumour in the one place, or on what he had seen in certain books, in the other.

¹ He had been previously called Shams Khān Dandānī. Bayley appears to me to be unnecessarily puzzled about the identity of Nasrat Khān. According to the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, Zafar Khān had only one brother, who was called Shams Khān, till the time when he was left as the governor of Mālwa, but at that time he was called Nasrat Khān without any explanation of the change in his name. Firishtah says the same. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 10) identifies the two names as belonging to one person, where he says "Shums Khan, entitled Noosrut Khan". Bayley spells the name Dandānī as Dindānī and says in a note on p. 95, called "Dindānī from *dandān* teeth". It appears from the text that the man had this name, because some of his front teeth had grown long and projected. If Dandānī is derived from Dandān, I do not see why it should be spelt Dindānī.

² Firishtah says that Muzaffar Shāh made over Sultān Hūshang to the custody of his grandson Ahmad Shāh, with the order to keep him imprisoned in a fort. Sultān Hūshang wrote a very humble supplication which Ahmad Shāh showed to his grandfather with a suggestion that Hūshang might be released. As at this time there was a disturbance in Mālwa, Sultān Hūshang was released and after a time the territory of Mālwa with the insignia of royalty was given to him and he was sent with Ahmad Shāh so that the latter might reinstate him in the government. Bayley's version is slightly different. According to him, Alp Khān sent his petition direct to Sultān Muzaffar and told him that Musa Khān who had been his lieutenant at Mandū had recovered a portion of Mālwa, but if he was released and sent there he would remain his obedient servant all his life. Sultan Muzaffar then sent him with Ahmad Khan and a large army to expel Musa Khān from Mandū. Musa Khān fled and Sultān Hūshang was then installed in Mandū (p. 85).

at the harsh treatment (accorded to them) by Nasrat Shah rebelled against the latter. The ¹ *Khujahdar* rescued him from Dhar and sent him to Gujrat. Such of his adherents as were left behind were treated with harshness and suffered hardship. The people of Malwa for fear of offending Sultan Muzaffar made Musa Khan who was a relation of Sultan Hushang their leader and they selected the fort of Mandu for their residence. Sultan Muzaffar on receiving this news released Sultan Hushang from imprisonment and sent Shahzada Ahmad Khan son of Muhammad Shah that he might recover possession of Malwa and deliver it over to him. Shahzada Ahmad Khan arrived at Dhar and taking possession of the country made it over to Sultan Hushang and returned by way of - Dahur to Gujrat as the pen forming letters black and fragrant as musk has narrated this clearly and explicitly in the section about Malwa.

In short in the year 812 intelligence came to Sultan Muzaffar Shah that the ² Rajputs of Kulinalot one of the dependencies of Kach had raised the dust of rebellion. Immediately on hearing this news he detached a large force for their punishment. It is said that he sent Khudawand Khan to attend on Shaikh Muhammad Qasim Budhu (asking the latter) to pray that the army of Islam might return with victory and triumph. His reverence the Shaikh on examining the muster roll of the men who had been sent as

¹ I do not know the exact meaning of *Khujahdar* which is in both MSS and in the lith ed. He might have been some kind of a palace official. Neither Bayley nor Firishtah gives any help for although the former refers to the *Tabaqat-i Akbari* in this connection neither says anything as to the way in which Nasrat Khan retired from Dhar. *Khujahdar* in the text edition.

The name may be *دھور* or *دھور* in one MS and *دھور* in the other and in the lith ed. The place is not mentioned by Firishtah or Bayley.

² The name of the place is *کھنہ* *Kulnakot* in one MS and in the lith ed. and *کھنہ* *Kunthakot* in the other MS. I cannot find any mention of the expedition in Firishtah or in Col Briggs. It is mentioned in Bayley's History which is based on the *Mirat-i Iskandari* but he places it in 810 A H the same year as the expedition to Malwa and he calls the place *Kamlhalot* which is very likely the correct name but he adds a note that the *Tārīkh-i Alfi* calls the place *Kanthkot* and he says that Khudawand Khan was sent in command of the expedition (p. 86).

members of the army, drew his pen across certain names. It so happened that when the army returned under the wing of triumph and victory, every person across whose names the Shāikh had drawn his pen was found to have attained to martyrdom.

In the year 813 A.H., Sultān Muzaffar became ill in the city of Nahrwāla Pattan. He placed Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān on the throne of the empire in the presence of the nobles and chief men of the country, and conferred on him the title of Nāsu-ud din Ahmad Shāh. According to his orders the *Khutba* was read in the prince's name on the pulpits of Islām. Three years and eight months and sixteen days had elapsed on that day since ² the commencement of his rule. Five months and thirteen days after the accession of Sultān Ahmad Shāh, he redeemed the pledge of life, and in the month of Safar 814 A.H., he passed from the old caravansarai of the world, to the happy land of a future life. He is buried in the country of Pattan, and he has been styled *Khudā-i-gān Kabīr*.

¹ Bayley (pp. 86, 87) says that according to the *Mirāt-i-Ahmadī*, Sultān Muzaffar reigned for eighteen years, eight months and fourteen days. He also quotes the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* about the period of his reign and the date of his death, and also quotes the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī*, in explanation of the statement made in the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, though an explanation was scarcely necessary. He also quotes a story from the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī* according to which Ahmad Khān imprisoned Sultān Muzaffar and gave poison to him, after obtaining an opinion from some learned men, that a son would be justified in killing a man who had killed his father. Sultān Muzaffar asked him why he was in such a hurry. Ahmad Khān answered him in words of the *Kurān*, "All men have their times appointed, and when the hour is come, they cannot delay or advance it a moment." Bayley after considering the facts given in the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* and the *Tārīkh-i-Alfī*, says that although the story told by the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī* is not absolutely irreconcilable with them, they are at least *prima facie* in conflict with it, and at any rate seem to dispose of the alleged motive of the crime. This is correct, if the haste to grasp the sovereignty be considered to be the motive, but not correct if the desire was to avenge his father's death.

Firishtah says nothing about these things. He says that Sultān Muzaffar became ill at the end of Šafar 814 A.H., and died on the 8th of Rabi'ul-ākhar, 12, after a month and a few days, and he appointed Ahmad Khān to be his successor, as he considered him to be able than his own surviving son. He was 71 years of age at the time of his death.

² Since his second accession, after the death of Muhammad Shāh

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN AHMAD SHAH SON OF SULTAN MUHAMMAD SON OF SULTAN MUZAFFAR

When Sultān Ahmad Shah reclined on the pillow on the throne of empire and the seat of greatness he conferred honours on the nobles and the chief men of the kingdom the great men of the city and the chiefs of various groups and gave a share of his gifts to all sections of the people. He kept the officers and writers charged with matters connected with the revenue in their former positions and made great exertions in the matter of increasing the cultivation and in the building up of the country and the administration of justice.

When the news of the accession of Sultān Ahmad Shah reached ¹ Firuz Khan son of Sultān Muzaffar Shah in the town of Barōda he owing to his envy and jealousy raised the standard of revolt and hostility. He conferred the position of *ta'ir* on Jivan Das Khattry. Amir Mahmud Barki who was the governor of Kanbayat also joined Firuz Khan. Other *amirs* who were wicked by nature considering Firuz Khan to be a source of profit and success for themselves united with him. They took Firuz Khan to Kanbayat and in that town Haibat Khan son of Sultān Muzaffar had an interview with him. After a few days Saadat Khan and Sher Khan sons of Sultān Muzaffar came and united with them. Firuz Khan gained strength and power from the union of his brothers and advanced towards the town of Bahroj. From that place they wrote a letter to Sultān Hushang Ghuri and requested him that he should help them with his spirit and courage and agreed to pay him a certain number of

¹ According to Bayley (p. 88) it was Modud the son of Firūz Khan who was governor of Barodah who raised the rebellion. Firishtah like Nīlām ud dīn says that it was Firūz Khan himself. Bayley says in a note that the Tabaqāt and Firishtah have Firūz but the Muntakhab ut Tawārikh has Mu'd ud dīn and this confirms the Mirāt-i Sikandari. Among the rebels adherents Firishtah has حاکم الملک و ملک سر و ملک کرم خسرو و حدود و بناگداس کهنری. Col Briggs has two names Jeevundas and Vinaikdas Kauhtry while Bayley has Jivan Das and Payag Das. The name is حدودداس کهنری in the MSS and in the lith. ed.

² Firishtah calls him Amir Mahmūd Turī. Barki seems to be incorrect though it is found in several places further on but Turk is also found in a few places.

lakhs of *tankās* at each stage, as contribution to his expenses. They also sent to every *zamīndār* that was in the country of Gujrāt, a horse and a robe of honour, to induce him to join them.

When this news reached Ahmad Shāh, he collected his troops, and advanced rapidly towards Bahrōj. When he arrived there, he in order to extinguish the flames of the disturbance sent an emissary to the *amīrs* with the following message:

Couplet

“Whom God had exalted, fate will not see abased,

Who to Him is dear, the world will not see him lowered

As *Khudā-ī-gān Kabīr* (the great Lord), Muzaffar Shāh took me by the hand, and placed me on the throne of empire, and the foundation of the high mansion, and the strong palace of my empire has been strengthened by the allegiance of the *amīrs* and the well-known men of the country, and of all sections of the people, it is right and proper that you should not place your foot outside the line of loyalty and obedience, for the result of rebellion is destruction. Each one should be contented with the fiefs, which *Khudā-ī-gān Kabīr* Muzaffar Shāh allotted to him, and should hope for other favours.” When the emissary delivered this message, the *amīrs* consulted among themselves, and sent Haibat Khān who was the uncle of Ahmad Shāh, with him. As Ahmad Shāh lavished great favours on Haibat Khān, Firūz Khān and the other Khāns, becoming assured of safety and favour, hastened to attend on him. The latter cheered each one of them with fresh favours and tried to draw their hearts towards him. He confirmed their old *jāgīrs*, and after arranging the affairs of that part of the country in the best possible way, arranged to return towards Pattan. At this time news was brought to him that Sultān Hūshang was advancing in that direction from Dhār, with the object of helping Firūz Khān.

Sultān Ahmad immediately on hearing this news left the fort of Bahroj, and advanced by successive marches to the village of ¹Wantaḥ. At that place ²Bhikan Ādam Khān Afghān who during

¹ The name is *وَنَاح* and *وَسَح* in the two MSS, and *وَنَاح* in the lith ed. I have not been able to find the name in Firishtah, in Bayley or in the *Rās Mālā*.

² According to the *Mirāt-ı Sikandarī* (Bayley, page 88), the rebels headed by Mōdūd (or Firūz Khān) “defeated Bikan and Ādam Afghān, the king’s men.”

the reign of Sultān Muzaffar Shah was the feudatory of Barōda and at present on account of his hostility (to Sultān Ahmad) was wandering about came and attended on Ahmad Shah and was received with favour by the latter. As he had now completely settled the matter connected with Firuz Khan he with perfect calmness physical and mental turned to the conflict and warfare with Sultān Hushang and sent Imad ul mulk in advance of himself to engage him. Hūshang in shame and humiliation returned to his own country. Imad ul mulk pursued him for several stages and seizing the *Amindars* who had joined him brought them with himself to attend on the Sultān.

When Sultān Ahmad Shah at the time of his return arrived at the town of Asīwal and the air (climate) of that place appeared to be congenial to him he after consulting the omens and taking the advice of the asylum of all truth Shaikh Ahmad Kanbu may his tomb be sanctified! laid on the ground the first brick for building the great city of Ahmadabad which has no equal among the cities of Hindustan on the bank of the Sabarmati in the month of Dhīqa dah 813 A H. He laid the foundation of ¹a fort and a *Jama* mosque and many markets and he built 360 *puras* outside the fortifications each of which contained a mosque and a *ba ur* and was surrounded by a wall. If during the time when Ahmadabad was in a most flourishing condition some one had said that there was no other city in the whole world which was so grand and which was so beautifully arranged and decorated he would not have been guilty of any exaggeration.

Bayley (p 88) says in a note the Tab i Akbari makes these the name of one man but the probabilities are in favour of the text. Bikan Afghan escaped and rejoined the Sultan. According to the context of the Tabaqat the name appears to be that of one man.

In the lith ed of Firishtah Ādam Bhankar is said to have been ordered to fight the rebels and to have been defeated by them but this is not mentioned by Col Briggs.

¹ دو قلعه two forts in the text edition appears to be a mistake

Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān again revolted in the year 840 A H, at the instigation of ¹Malik Badr 'Alā', who was a very near relation of Muzaffar Shāh, and again took the path of violence and rebellion and leaving the central part of the kingdom, took shelter in the hills of Īdai. Sultān Ahmad Shāh on hearing this news advanced to destroy them, and when he arrived in the town of Wantaj, he sent Fath Khān, son of Sultān Muzaffar in advance of himself (But) he also at the instigation of ³Sayyid Ibrāhīm Nizām the feudatory of the town of Mahrāsa joined his brothers. Sultān Ahmad on hearing this advanced towards Mahrāsa. Malik Badr 'Alā and Sayyid Ibrāhīm entitled Rukn Khān had a ditch dug around the fort of Mahrāsa, and began to make the necessary arrangements for defending it. Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān summoned Raimal the Rāja of Īdai, to help them, and they brought him to a place called Ankhōr, which is five *karōhs* from the town of Mahrāsā.

When Sultān Ahmad arrived in the vicinity of the town, he first of all sent a body of learned men to Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān, that they might remove the veil of neglect from before their eyes, and might reveal to them what was right. When the emissaries did not receive such a reply as they had wished for, they came back. The Sultān out of his great mercy sent some other men and by their mouths sent the following messages: "I am giving you assurances of safety, you may go wherever you like." Malik Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān sent the following reply: "If Nizām-ul-mulk, who is the

¹ Col Briggs calls him Mullik Dear, but he does not say that he instigated the revolt. It is not clear how he was related to Muzaffar Shāh. He is described as puzzle-headed in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* Bayley (p 93, footnote †) speculates about his relationship with Muzaffar Shāh but cannot say anything definite about it.

² See note 1 above.

³ Firishtah calls him Sayyid Ibrāhīm, who bore the title of Rukn Khān, and was the *jāgirdār* of Mahrāsa. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 15) says as regards the name of the place, that Firishtah always spells it مهراسه, and so he has also called it Mahrāsa, but the correct name is Mowrasa. The name is spelled مهراسا in the MSS of the *Tabaqāt*, but the lith ed has موداسا. Bayley has Mōrāsah. As regards the double name Ibrāhīm Nizām it appears from Bayley, p 93, that it really means Ibrāhīm the son of Nizām. He was the *jāgirdār* of Mōrāsah under Sultān Ahmad, but was induced to join the rebels.

na'ib al-ir and Malik Ahmad Aziz who is the *larghar* (superintendent) and *na'ib iakildar* (the deputy *iakil* in attendance) and Malik Sa'id ul mulk and Saif K̲hawajāh are sent to us to take us with them we would be assured of our safety and come and attend on you. Sultān Ahmad gave orders that the noblemen named should go to the gate of the fort but they should be very careful of the deceit and treachery of Badr Ula and they should not go into the fort. The above named *amirs* then proceeded to the gate of the fort of Mahrasi. Malik Badr Ula and Rukn K̲han kept a body of men in ambuscade and themselves received the noblemen with courtesy and respect. They then separated Malik Nizām ul mulk and Malik Sa'id ul mulk from the other *amirs* and engaged them in talk and conversation. At this time the men who were in ambush came out and seized Malik Nizam ul mull and Malik Sa'id ul mulk and carried them into the fort. Nizam ul mulk said in a loud voice Go and tell the Sultān that he should not allow any delay in seizing the fort. Whatever fate was allotted to us has overtaken us. Malik Badr Ulā put chains round the feet of both of them and kept them guarded in a dark dungeon. The real reason for such conduct on their part was this that Malik Badr Ula knew that as long as these *amirs* should remain in confinement no injury of any kind would reach the fort.

When Sultān Ahmad heard what had happened he gave orders that batteries should be allotted to the different commanders and the fort should be attacked from every side. On the 5th Jamād ul awwal in the year 814 A.H. (1411 A.D.) the Sultān (in person) attacked the gate of the fort. The brave *amirs* seeing this jumped into the ditch and clambered to the fort and in the twinkling of an eye they mounted on the wall and commenced to take measures for liberating Malik Nizam ul mulk. As the moment of the death of those two beloved noblemen had not yet come they were both brought out and the rebels were completely routed and destroyed. Malik Badr Ula and Rukn K̲han who were the leaders of the traitors and chiefs of the rebels were executed. ¹ Firuz K̲han and the Raja

¹ There was apparently two Firūz K̲hāns (1) Firūz K̲han son of Sultān Mu'azzar and (2) Firuz K̲han son of Shams K̲han. The former led the revolt against Ahmad Shah and fought with him. Finally however the Raja of Idar

of Īdar on hearing of the victory fled and took shelter in the hills of Īdar

After some days, Rāmal, the Rāja of Īdar, wishing to redress and remedy what had happened behaved treacherously towards Fīrūz Khān, and having seized his treasures and elephants sent them for the service of Sulṭān Ahmad. He also commenced with great humility and submissiveness to send tribute. The Sulṭān then returned to Ahmadābād under the wings of triumph and victory. Fīrūz Khān fled with his brothers, and went to the country of Nāgōr. On the day on which Rāna Mūkul fought with Fīrūz Khān, the son of Shams Khān Dandānī, Fīrūz Khān the Shāhzāda attained martyrdom.

In the year 816, ¹Malik Ahmad Saikējī, Malik Shāh Malik and Malik Ahmad son of Shēr Malik, Bhikan Ādam Khān Afghān and Malik 'Isa Sālāi again awakened up the disturbance which had fallen asleep, and they united some of the turbulent *zamīndārs* with them, and overran a part of the country, and every wretched man that was there came and joined them. About this time the Rāja of ²Mandal, the Rāja of Nādōt and Badhūl

behaved treacherously towards him, and he fled to the other Fīrūz Khān, who had succeeded his father at Nāgōr. Here he was killed according to the *Tabaqāt* in the course of the fight between the other Fīrūz Khān and Rāna Mūkul. Nizām-ud-dīn calls him Shāhzāda, to distinguish him from his namesake, when mentioning his death. According to Firishtah he went to Nāgōr, and was killed by the *hākīm* of that place, i.e., either by his namesake, or by some officer of his. As regards Fīrūz Khān No. 2, it will be remembered, that his father Shams Khān, after being expelled from Dhār, went to Nāgōr, and became the ruler there. This Fīrūz Khān was alive long after the death of the other which took place apparently in 815, for it appears that as late as 820 A.H., he sent a message to Sulṭān Ahmad, to exculpate himself from all complicity with Sulṭān Hūshang and his partisans.

Col Briggs is inclined to think that there was only Feroze Khan, and he was the son of his uncle Shams Khan. See footnote 2, page 19 of vol IV of his work. According to Bayley it was Mōdūd who fled to Nāgōr, and was killed in a battle between Rānā Mokal, Rāja of Chitōr and Shams Khān Dandānī.

¹ According to Firishtah, Sulṭān Ahmad invaded Jalwāra in 816 A.H. and it was during his absence that Malik Ahmad Sark(g)jangī and Shāh Malik, son of Shaikh Malik and Ādam Bhankar raised the revolt. Col Briggs (p. 17) has Kutchy instead of Sark(g)jangī and he calls Ādam Bhankar of the lithed Ādam of Bhukkur. Bayley (p. 95) calls 'Usmān Ahmad Saikheji سرکدهی Sarkanjī in the text edition.

² Probably Mandalgarh

sent petitions to Sultān Hūshang and incited and tempted him to come and conquer Gujrat. Owing to his foolishness he put his trust on the help of these rebels and advanced towards Gujrat. Sultān Ahmad saw that the dust of disturbance had risen from both sides sent his own brother Latīf ¹ Khan son of Muhammad Shah with Malik Nizam ul mulk the *na'ib al amir* to punish Malik Shah Malik and the other *amirs*. He himself with a well equipped army advanced to crush Sultān Hushang. When he arrived at Bandhū which is in the neighbourhood of Champaur he sent Malik Imad ul mulk Samarqandī with a large force in advance of himself. When Sultān Hushang heard that a slave of Sultān Ahmad was coming to give him battle he considered his grandeur higher than that and returned to his own country. Imad ul mulk seized a number of the men who were the prime movers and the cause of the disturbance and brought them before the Sultān. It can however be well understood by intelligent men who know the niceties of things that Sultān Hushang was only seeking a pretext for a retreat. It was quite possible for him to send one of his slaves to meet Imad ul mulk and he might also have advanced in person when Sultān Ahmad advanced to reinforce his own army.

About the time when the news of the retreat of Sultān Hushang came fast moving couriers brought the news that Malik Shah Malik and the other *amirs* finding that they had not the strength to meet (the Sultān's army) had fled without waiting to fight. Shahzada Latīf Khan took up a position after pursuing them for some distance. Shah Malik in consultation with the other disturbers of the peace who had combined with him made a sudden attack in the darkness of the night on the Shahzada's camp but as the soldiers were all present and alert they could not effect anything. They left a large number dead and fled and took shelter with the *amindar* of Karnal. The Sultān on receiving this news performed the rites of thanking God and made the people of Ahmadabad happy by his gifts and favours.

¹ According to Bayley (p. 96) Prince Latīf Khan had orders to bring Kanha to account and the latter was driven into the country of Sorath.

Bandhu is called Pandū in Bayley p. 96 and its situation is described as in *pa gana* Sanouli ten miles from the hill of Champaur.

As the Rāja of ¹Karnāl had given shelter in his territory to Shāh Malik and the other rebels, the Sultān, in the year 817 A.H. determined on punishing him and teaching him a lesson. When he arrived at Karnāl, which is celebrated as Jūnagarh, the Rāja came out, and engaged him in a battle, but in the end he fled and retired into the citadel of Karnāl, and most of his best men fell, and departed to the city of eternity at the time of the flight. Sultān Ahmad besieged the fort, and sent detachments every day for plundering and ravaging the country of ²Sōrath. After a few days in the month of Rajab of that year, he seized the fort by an attack in great force. The Rāja, with the others who were concerned in creating disturbance, fled to the top of the hill of Karnāl. Then in great humility and weakness, they came down, and begged for quarter and again began to pay tribute according to the old custom. Sultān Ahmad left Shāh Abūl ³K̤hān and Saiyid Qāsim in order to collect the tribute, and returned to Ahmadābād, his capital.

In the year 821, news came that Naṣir, son of ‘Ādil K̤hān the ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, feeling very proud of his power and greatness had overrun some parts of Sultānpūr and Nadarbāi. Immediately on hearing this, (Sultān Ahmad) marched rapidly towards Nadarbār. At the same time he sent a detachment to seize the fort of ⁴Tambōl,

¹ According to Firishtah Sultān Ahmad invaded Karnāl or Garnāl or Girnāl because he had heard a great deal in praise of the place, and because the Rāja had never submitted to any Musalmān prince. When he was returning from Karnāl, he demolished a temple at a place called Saiyidpūr, (it is curious that the place should have such a name) which was adorned with various gems and pictures. It appears however from a quotation from a Muhammadan historian, apparently Firishtah, in Forbes's *Rās Mālā*, vol. I, page 329 (1856), that the name of the place where the temple was situated was Somāpūr.

Firishtah also says that Sultān Ahmad sent Malik Tuhfa, on whom he conferred the title of Tāj-ul-mulk on a *gehāl* all over Gujrāt, and the latter slew many, and laid the burden of the *jizya* and *khirāj* on others, and converted many to Islām. In 819 Sultān Ahmad himself went on a similar expedition.

Firishtah mentions one Hadrat K̤hān Walī of Dehlī coming to Gujrāt, but it does not appear who he was.

² سورب in the text edition.

³ Firishtah calls them two brothers, Saiyid Abul K̤hair and Saiyid Abul Qāsim.

⁴ According to Col. Briggs (p. 19), "Tumbole, a small hill fort in the district of Buglana. The district from its local position naturally belongs to Kandeish, but it had from a very early period rajas independent of that province."

which is situated on the boundary of the Deccan. When he arrived at Nādarbar ¹ Ādil Khan fled to Asir. The forces that had been sent to the fort of Tambol took possession of it by giving assurances of safety to the commandant. As it was the rainy season and the *charua* (beasts of burden ?) suffered great hardship in the open plains, Sultān Ahmad Shih wanted to return to Ahmadābād but very swift couriers brought the news that the Rajas of Idar and Champanir and Mandal and Nadot had sent repeated representations to Sultān Hushang and had brought him into Gujrat and that he had arrived at the town of Mahrasa.

At this time a man riding a camel who had come from the country of Nagor in the course of nine days arrived at Nadarbar and brought a petition from Firuz Khan son of Shams Khan Dandani the purport of which was that Sultān Hushang was coming to conquer Gujrat and as he had come to know from the letters of Jahan Khan that this *faqir* (i.e. he himself) was not honest and pure in his intentions towards Sultān Ahmad he had written to the *faqir* that the *amindars* of Gujrat had sent repeated petitions to him and had begged him to invade Gujrat and he was accordingly starting for that country. It would be right and proper that he also should make himself ready quickly and should come (in which case) after the conquest of Gujrat the country of Nahrwala would be conferred on him. As His Majesty is his lord and master he has thought it right and proper that he should send him notice of this.

Sultān Ahmad in spite of the rains marched rapidly and crossing the Narbāda encamped on the bank of the Mahindri and when in the course of a week he arrived in the vicinity of the town of Mahrasa Sultān Hushang's spies took the news to him and he sent for and reproached the *amindars* and after scratching the back of his head returned to his own country. As Sultān Ahmad had come with only a small retinue he halted there for a few days for collecting his troops. At this time news came that owing to the disturbances the Raja of Sorath had again neglected to pay his tribute and

¹ It was Nasir son of Ādil Khan a few lines above but it is Ādil Khān here. The correct name however is Nasir son of Ādil Khan (see p. 196).

See note 1 pp. 193-194.

son of 'Ādil Khān the ruler of Asī, had in concert with Ghaznīn, son of Sultān Hūshang, besieged the fort of ¹ Tālnīr and had fraud and deceit taken possession of it, and with the advice and concurrence of the Rāja of Nādōt had invaded the country of Sultān and had retired after plundering and ravaging it. Sultān Ahmad immediately on hearing this nominated Mahmūd Khān with a large

As regards Tālnīr or Thālnīr it appears from a note in page 101 of Bayley's *Āt* that "Thālnīr had been assigned to Iftikhār ul-mulk (who was Nasīr's younger brother), by their father, Malik Rāja, the first of the Fārūkīs of Khāndēsh, and with it certain territories, as his inheritance. Nasīr, who seems to have been restless, ambitious, and unscrupulous, seized it from Iftikhār-ul-mulk." Firishtah says it was taken by force, but Tabaqāt Akbarī says by stratagem, any way, he got it, and was assisted in so, by Ghaznīn Khān, who was his wife's nephew. * * *

For their object at first was merely to seize Thālnīr, and the attack on Sultānpūr an after-thought, or whether this was designed from the beginning, the fact was that the two confederates renewed their attempt on the provinces, and, aided by the Rāja of Nādōt (Tabaqāt Akbarī), for a time carried all before them. On the whole it seems likely that the attack on Sultān Hūshang, the rising in Sōrath, and the second adventure of Nasīr in Sultānpūr, were concerted movements and intended to be simultaneous, if it had not been for Sultān Ahmad's prompt march to meet Sultān Hūshang, and the precipitate flight of that irresolute and treacherous prince, that Ahmad would have had a very serious task on his hand.

This is also confirmed by the Cambridge History of India, pp 296, where however Malik Rāja is called Raja Ahmad, and Iftikhār ul mulk is called Hasan. Malik Rāja divided his dominion giving the eastern portion to Iltutmish, and the western to Hasan. Nasir founded the city of Burhānpūr in 1400 and captured the strong fort of Asir from a Hindū chieftain while Hasan established himself at Thālner. In 1417 Nasir with the help of Hūshang, who had married his sister, captured Thālner, and imprisoned Hasan. Then Sultān Ahmad sent an army which compelled Nasir to retire to Asī, where he was besieged. Peace was made, Nasir swearing fealty to Ahmad and the latter resuming Nasir's title of Khān. Hasan retired to Gujarāt, where he and his descendant found a home and intermarried with the royal house.

From the treaty between Sultān Ahmad and Nasir, an estrangement took place between Khāndēsh and Mālwa. Nasir resented Hūshang's failure to protect him adequately against Sultān Ahmad. In 1429 in spite of the former enmity between his family and the Bahmanīs, he gave his daughter in marriage to Jā-ud dīn Ahmad, son of Ahmad Shāh, the 9th Bahmanī King, but this engendered strife, and Khāndēsh after a disastrous war with the Bahmanīs, at length driven into the arms of Gujarāt.

force to proceed to the country of Sorath and he went there and recovered tribute from the *zamindars*. The Sultān also sent Malīk Mahmud Barkī and Muḥḥḥ ul mulk to go and punish Naṣīr the son of Ādil Ḳhan and to teach him a lesson. Malīk Mahmud and Muḥḥḥ ul mulk in the first instance raided Nadot and a part of that country. The Raja being too weak to withstand them paid the tribute which had been agreed upon. Then when they arrived in the vicinity of Sultānpūr Chaznīn Ḳhan retired to his own country. Naṣīr Ḳhan son of Ādil Ḳhan retired to the fort of Talnīr and prepared to defend himself there. After the siege had been protracted for a length of time he prayed for the pardon of his offences through the intervention of Malīk Mahmud Barkī. Sultān Ahmad drew the pen of forgiveness across his offences and conferred distinction on him by giving him a robe of honour and the title of Naṣīr Ḳhan.

As Sultān Hushang had reportedly invaded Gujrat and had soiled and tarnished the brightness of Sultān Ahmad's heart which was the seat of peace and happiness with the dust of pain the latter in the month Safar of the afore mentioned year advanced to conquer the kingdom of Malwa. On the way the representatives of the Raja of Idar and Champanir and Nadot and other *zamindars* came and did homage to him and prayed for the pardon of their (master's) offences. They also engaged that they would remit double the annual tribute. Sultān Ahmad shut his eyes to the offences of these men and accepted their excuses. As the Raja of Mandal continued in his pride and rebellion and did not try to discontinue his offences Sultān Ahmad left Malīk Nizam ul mulk to be the regent of the kingdom during his absence and left the work of punishing the Raja in his charge and in spite of the weather and the narrowness of the road himself advanced into Malwa. When by successive marches he arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of ¹Ḳahadah Sultān Hushang selected some broken land near it and strengthened his position by having the river of Ḳahadah on one side and having cut down large trees made a *ḵharband* (a sort of *zariba* made of trunks and branches of trees) in front of him. Sultān Ahmad stood mounted

¹ The name looks like Ḳahawa كاهوا in the lith. ed. of Firishtah but Col Briggs has Ḳahada. According to Bayley (p. 103) Ḳahadah is the name of the river on which Ujain is situated.

on an extensive plain. He directed that ¹Amir Mahmūd Barkī should command the right wing, and Malik Farīd ‘Imād-ul-mulk the left, while Nasir-ud-dīn ‘Add-ud-daula would be in the centre. It so happened that while seated on his horse he examined the battle-field, his attention fell on the circle fixed for Farīd, and seated there on his horse, he sent a servant to summon him, so that he might confer his father’s title, which was ‘Imād-ul-mulk, on him. The messenger came back (and said) that the Malik had rubbed oil on his body, and he would arrive after a moment. The Sultān said, “This is the day of battle. Farīd will find sorrow and shame on account of this delay”, and without waiting any longer advanced to the battlefield.

When the two *bādshāhs* stood in front of each other, and the two armies met in great excitement and clamour, an elephant belonging to Sultān Ahmad’s army rushed on Sultān Hūshang’s troops, and caused much havoc and scattered the horsemen in all directions. Ghaznīn Khān, son of Sultān Hūshang, coming within bow shot, shot many arrows on the forehead of the animal and wounded and killed it. From all sides warriors thirsting for battle rushed and fell on Sultān Ahmad’s army, and there was great distress among the men of Gujrāt. At this time Malik Farīd mounted on his horse and followed by his men came towards the battlefield, but although he tried, ²he could not find his way into it. At last a man told him, “I know a path by which you can get behind the enemy’s army, and can launch an attack on it.” Malik Farīd knowing the finding

¹ Amir Mahmūd appears here to be called in one MS as ترک Turk and not as in previous passages برکی Barkī. Firishtah all along calls him Amir Mahmūd Turk. Bayley, however, on page 102 calls him Malik Mahmūd Bargī. As regards Farid, although he has been called Malik Farīd ‘Imād ul mulk, he was the son of ‘Imad-ul-mulk, but that title had not yet been conferred on him, and the Sultān wanted to confer it on him there and then, as appears from the next sentence.

² According to the Mirāt-i Sikandarī (Bayley, p. 103) Farīd “came to the side of a river, where there was a difficult ford”. After a little while a man pointed out a way to him which led to the rear of Sultān Hoshang’s army.

The battle is mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, as a fiercely contested one, but the name of the place where it took place is not mentioned and no details are given.

of the pathway to be a piece of unhopd for good fortune advanced along it At this time when the two armies were contending with each other the detachment of Mahl Farid appeared before Sultān Hushang's army and he at once and without hesitation fell on it and there was a great battle Although Sultān Hushang was personally ¹ bold and courageous yet not being victorious in the battle he took the road of flight and fled galloping to the fort of Mandu Much booty fell into the hands of Sultān Ahmad and his soldiers and they went in pursuit till within one *laroh* of Mandu Sultān Ahmad also sent detachments in different directions so that they plundered and ravaged the country and cut down trees both those that bore fruit and others that did not in the vicinity of Mandu As the rainy season had now arrived they turned back and returned to Gujrat They trampled down (the crops etc.) in the countries of Champanir and Nadot which lay on their way After arriving at Ahmadabad Sultān Ahmad held many entertainments and festivities in the course of some months and everyone who had exerted himself even a little was distinguished by favours and kindnesses and had title conferred on him

At the beginning of *Dhīrā dah* in the year 821 A H (the Sultān) determined to punish ² the Raja of Champanir and advancing by successive marches besieged the hill of Champanir which is three ⁴ *larohs* in height and seven *larohs* in circumference He shut up all entrances and exits and waited for the blowing of the breezes of victory and conquest After some days the Raja in great humility and distress sent a *kalil* and submitted that This slave (i.e. he

¹ سجاع و مردانه in the lith ed but سجاع و فرانه in the MS I think the former is the better reading

The readings are doubtful One MS and the lith ed have اما و رو اما و رو حنگ بودہ The other has اما و رو حان دیگر بودہ The former reading is probably correct The latter certainly is not اما و رو حنگ بودہ in the text edition

² He is called Turbang Das in the *Mirat i Sikandari* Bayley page 104 Turbang is a variant of *Tribhanga* lit broken in three a name given to Krishna as indicating the posture in which he is shown as standing in the ordinary pictures

⁴ This is absurd but I cannot get the correct altitude of the hill anywhere Probably the path to the fort was three *karohs* in length

himself) has all along been a slave of that threshold, and has always caused himself to be written down as a ¹ dependant of Ahmad Shāh. If owing to his innate generosity he would accept the excuses for the offences of this humble one, the latter would send all his expenses for one year into the treasury, and would pay the annual tribute.” As Sultān Ahmad had at this time another achievement in his mind, he accepted the Rāja’s excuses and took the tribute.

In the beginning of Safar of 822 A H (1419 A D) he advanced towards the town of ² Sōnkaia and having plundered and ravaged a part of the country round it, he encamped on the 22nd Safar nearer the town, and ordered the erection of a *Jāma’* Mosque there, and appointed the necessary officers directed by the *Shara’*. He marched from that place on the 11th Rabī’-ul-āwwal of that year and encamped at ³ Mānkī, and ordered that a strong fort should be built there as a military post. On the 12th Rabī’-ul-āwwal, he started towards Mandū, and having punished the ⁴ inhabitants and infidels of the hill of Kāntū, he proceeded along the way by rapid marches. On the way Maulānā Mūsa and ⁵ ‘Alī Hāmīd came as emissaries from Sultān

¹ The word is *برسنگداس* or *برسنگداس* in the MSS and in the lith ed. I suppose it means a dependant or protégé, or is it only a variant of his name Tirbang Dās.

² The name is *سونکھرا* or *سونکھرا* in the MSS, and *سونگر* Sōngar in the lith ed. Bayley (p. 104) calls it Sōnkherah Bahādurpūr. Firishtah’s account differs from that in the text. He says at the end of that year (821 A H) Ahmad Shāh caused the fort of Sōnkaia (or Sōngarh) to be repaired and built a mosque there, and then marching towards Andarun (Idar?), and gave orders for plundering and ravaging Mālwa. Col. Briggs’s (p. 22) account is similar, but he does not mention the building of the mosque, and he says that Ahmad Shah proceeded in person to Idur, and then sent a detachment into Malwa to lay waste that country. The place is called Songarh in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, and is said in a note to be at 20°, 11” North and 73°, 36” East.

³ The name is *مانکی* or *ماکئی* in the MSS and in the lith ed. According to Bayley (p. 105) the name of the village is Māknī and it is a dependency of Sōnkherah. It is not mentioned by Firishtah. In the text-edition it is *مانکی* Mānktī.

⁴ They are called the infidels of the hill of Kanthur in Bayley, and are referred to in the Cambridge History of India, page 298, as the ‘infidels, of the Sātpūras’.

⁵ The name is *علي حامد* ‘Alī Hāmīd in one MS, and *علي حامدار* ‘Alī Jamādār in the other. It is *علي حامدار* ‘Alī Jāmdār in the lith ed. Firishtah

Hushang and prayed through the intervention of Malik Nizam ul mulk the *na'ib al ir* and Malik Mahmud Turk and Malik Husam ud din with great submission and humility that it was not right that a *badshah* professing the Islamic faith should cause injury to the Muslims and the helpless people of Malwa. The Sultan noble spirited and generous of heart accepted their prayers and wrote an affectionate letter to Sultan Hushang. He then turned back and encamped in the neighbourhood of Champaur on the 17th Rabi' ul thani. He levelled to the ground wherever there was an idol temple and then went back to Ahmadabad.

In the year 823 A.H. he moved out with the intention of building some forts. First of all he laid the foundations of a strong fort in Jinur on the bank of the Mahendri. After that he built a line of fortifications round the town of Dhamod and tried to increase its population and cultivation. After that when he arrived in the town of Karitha he ordered that the old fort which had been

does not give the name but describes them as the ambassadors of Sultan Hushang. According to the *Mir'at-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 105 the correct name is Ali Jamdar and *Jamdar* means treasurer.

¹ One MS. has 20th but the other and the lith. ed. have 7th.

Firishtah does not mention the building of these forts but I find the following in *Ras Mala* vol. I page 348. The passage is within inverted commas but the work from which it is quoted is not mentioned. Having also founded forts in such places he left garrisons in them among which may be mentioned the fort at the town of Jinoor in the Pergunnah of Bareah and that of Shiv poor. After this he established the market town of Dahmod among the mountains where he erected a fortification. After this the fort of Kareih (Kaira or Kuree?) built in A.D. 1304 by order of Alp Khan who governed the country for Allah ood deen Khilji was repaired and named Sultanabad. It would be seen that the statements made in the quotation agree closely with those in the text. There are differences in the spelling of the names of the places where the forts were built in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. but I do not consider it necessary to mention them. In the *Mir'at-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 10 the first fort is said to have been built at Janur in the *pargana* of Bar Sanval. After that the Sultan built the town of Dhamood in the hills and he erected a fort there. He repaired the fort at Kareih which was founded in the time of Sultan Ala'ud din by Alp Khan Sanjar in 704 A.H. (1304 A.D.) but had fallen into decay and he gave it the name of Sultanabad.

erected in the year ¹ 704 A H by Alp Khān Sanjar, the Deputy of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī should be entirely re-built, and having endeavoured to increase the cultivation and the population of the district, gave it the name of Sultānābād. He again marched in the direction of Chāmpānū at the end of the year 824 A H 1421 A D. He besieged it and extorted tribute, and on the 19th of Safar, 825 he advanced towards Sonkhera. He arrived there on the 22nd Safar, and laid the foundation of another *Jāma' masjid*.

At this time, news came that sometime ago ² Sultān Hūshang had left Mālwa, and had gone away elsewhere, and had completely

¹ The dates vary in the MSS and in the lith ed., but as the year of the Christian era in the passage quoted in the preceding note is 1301 A D 704 appears to be the correct A H year.

² As to Sultān Hūshang's disappearance Firishtah's account is, that as he knew that the fort of Mandū was so strong that Sultān Ahmad would not be able to capture it, and he wanted to achieve a feat that people would remember for a long time, he left it in charge of one of his chief officers, and went out himself with six thousand selected horsemen and left it by the Nāgōr gate, while Sultān Ahmad was encamped in front of the Sārangpūi gate with the object of capturing some fine *mast* elephants in Jājnagai, and coming back with them. According to Firishtah Sultān Ahmad did not know anything about Sultān Hūshang's departure, or his return, till he heard joy drums beaten, and saw flags hung out from the turrets of the fort of Mandū after he had returned. Apparently the siege was not at all a close one. Firishtah also gives another version from the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*. According to this, Sultān Hūshang assumed the dress of a horse merchant, and went to Jājnagai in order to procure elephants. Ahmad Shāh of Gujrāt, having heard that he had left his kingdom, and that his officers had divided it among themselves invaded Mālwa. In the first place he reduced the fort of Mahāswai and then marched to Mandū. I do not consider it necessary to give this version at greater length but I may point out that it agrees generally with the text.

The names of the *jāgīrs*, and of the *amīrs* on whom they were conferred, are not mentioned in the quotation from the *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*, but the collection of the *Lharīf* revenue is. According to Bayley, page 106, Sultān Hoshang is said to have gone to Jājnagar elephant hunting, and the people in the fort of Mahāsar having no hope of relief surrendered the keys to Sultān Ahmad.

Bayley discusses at some little length, in a note on page 106, the reason and motives of Sultān Ahmad's attack on Mandū. He thinks that Sultān Ahmad is not likely to have been induced to attack Mandū, a Musalmān country, merely by the absence of Hoshang, with whom he was at peace. He comes to the conclusion that Sultān Ahmad might have been led to believe that Sultān

disappeared. The *amirs* and the chiefs of the different sections of the people had taken possession of the country and had divided it among themselves. On hearing this news the Sultan marched towards Mandu and advancing by successive marches he laid siege to Mahisra. The *thanadar* prayed for quarter and entered the service of Ahmad Shah. The latter encamped on the 12th Rabi ul akhbir at the foot of the fort of Mandu and sent many detachments to ravage the country. Then when the rainy season approached he marched from the fort towards Ujjain. He divided the country among his *amirs* giving Dipulpur Banhar in fief to Malik Mukhlis ul mulk and Kantha to Malik Iarid Imad ul mulk and Mahindpur which is now celebrated as Muhammadpur to Malik Iftikhar ul mulk. The *amirs* sent their officers to the *parganas* and realised the instalment of the *Lharif* (rainy season crops) revenue.

Sultan Hushang returned at this time from his journey to Jaj nagar where he had gone to buy elephants. A detailed account of this matter is given in the section about Malwa and entered the fort of Mandu. After the end of the rains Sultan Ahmad went from

Hoshang had by some means come to an untimely end and he himself was as much entitled to the vacant throne as anyone else.

In the Cambridge History of India page 298 Sultan Hushang's expedition is called his famous (?) raid into Orissa. I do not think it was a famous raid in any way. It is clear from the account of the expedition given in Firishta that merchants frequently took their goods to Jaj nagar from Malwa and the neighbouring country for the merchants of that country apparently knew what colour of horses the Ray had a partiality for and what merchandise his subjects were likely to buy. It was a whimsical raid certainly to be undertaken by the ruler of a country which was exposed to attacks by a powerful neighbour.

¹ The name is مهرا in one MS and in the lith ed but مہر in the other MS. Firishta calls it the fort of مہرا. In the quotation from the Tarikh-i-Alfi it is called Maheswar. It is called Chola Mahesar in Bayley page 106. In the text edition it is مہر Mahir.

² کاسبا in the text edition.

³ Col Briggs (p. -) says that Jajnuggur is a city situated on the Mahanada river which empties itself into the sea in the province of Orissa. The forests of which have always been famous for wild elephants. There is no city of the name of Jaj nagar at present in Orissa there is a town called Jajpur but it is not on the Mahanadi. Probably the name of Jaj nagar was given to the province of Orissa. According to *Raja us Salatin* (190) p. 15 Northern Orissa was known as Jaj nagar.

Ujjain to Mandū on the 20th Ramadān, and sat down in front of the Dehlī gate. He distributed the batteries and laid siege to the ¹ hill. He sent a *farmān* to Ahmadābād, to summon ² Malik Ahmad Avāz so that he might bring with him treasure and some appliances. The Malik came on the 12th of Shawwāl, and waited on the Sultān. The latter conferred a robe of honour on him, and made over to him the duty of working the Tārāpūr battery. As on the return of Hūshang, Sultān Ahmad's troops, which had taken possession of the country of Mālwa, and were engaged in managing the *parganas* had again collected together, Sultān Ahmad thought it advisable that he should take up a position in the centre of the country and should send the *amīrs* to the towns and *parganas*. According to this decision he marched away from the foot of the fort, and advanced to Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang also betook himself to Sārangpūr by a different route. When the Gujrāt army arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, Sultān Hūshang sent an emissary, and behaving with great humility and submissiveness agreed to pay tribute. When Sultān Ahmad saw the humility and the weakness of the emissary he became ³ sure of his safety, and neglected to dig the ditch and to erect the *zarība* round his camp.

The same night, which was the 12th Muharram in the year 826 A H, Sultān Hūshang made a night attack on the camp. As the men were negligent a large number was slain, among them ⁴ Sāmat Rāy, Rāja of the country of Dandwāna, who was killed with five

¹ It is كوه, hill, in the MSS and in the lith ed. Probably the entire hill on which Mandū was built was besieged.

² He is called Muqarrab in the *Tārīkh-i Alfī*. He brought battering rams and engines with him, and he was detached to secure the passage by the Tārāpūr gate, which according to a note by Col Briggs (p. 24) was the southern entrance.

³ According to Firishtah the emissaries spoke with such flattery and urgency that Ahmad Shāh neglected not only to dig the ditch and make the thorn fence, but kept no night sentries.

⁴ He does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah. Sāmat Rāy may be a corrupt form of Sāmanta Rāy. He is called Sāmant Rājput Gīāsiah of the district of Dundāh who held the advanced post, in Bayley, page 108. The night attack is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, but may be one of the "desultory and inconclusive hostilities" mentioned on page 298. In the text-edition the name is سامت راجی راجہ، دندہ.

hundred Raypūts around him. When ¹ Sultān Ahmad woke up he did not find a single person in his pavilion. There were two post horses there. He mounted ² Malik Juna his *rikabdar* (stirrup holder) on one and himself mounted the other. Coming out of his suite of tents he saw the whole camp being destroyed and not knowing what to do went away towards the open country. After a little time he sent Malik Juna back to the camp so that he might make enquiry. When Malik Juna again got into the camp he found that Malik Muqarrab Ahmad Ayaz and Malik Farid had got their men together and were going towards the royal pavilion. They asked him news of the Sultān. Malik Juna after ascertaining the real state of things took the other two with him and went and waited on the Sultān. As the Sultān was naked (i.e. probably he had only some kind of night dress on him) Malik Muqarrab taking off his own arms put them on him. He also asked for leave to attack the enemy. The Sultān ordered: Wait a little while so that the light of the morning may appear. Malik Juna was again sent to the camp so that he might make further enquiry and ascertain where Sultān Hushang was and how he was occupied.

Malik Junū returned and said that Sultān Hushang's troops were busy plundering the camp and he himself was standing with a few others with all the royal horses and elephants collected round them. Sultān Ahmad advanced with the thousand horsemen who had come with Malik Muqarrab and Malik Farid at the approach of the dawn which indeed was a dawn of good fortune to effect the destruction of Hushang. When the two forces met face to face the Sultān with his followers attacked the enemy and doing all that was demanded of him in the way of activity and bravery inflicted wounds on Hushang and also received a wound himself. Sultān Hushang also in spite of the wound exerted himself with great bravery. About this time the ³ *filbans* attached to the Gujrat army recognised Sultān

¹ He is said to have been awakened by Malik Munir in Bayley page 108 but we hear nothing more of this man.

The name of the *rikabdar* is transliterated as Malik Jaunan in Bayley page 108.

³ According to Firishtah they were seated on their elephants which had been seized by Sultān Hushang.

Ahmad, and drove Sultān Hūshang before them, and although the latter tried to maintain his position, he was unable to do so, and in the end had to flee towards Sārangpūr. The tables were turned now, and the men who had been engaged in looting the Gujrāt camp, became food for the sword, and all the elephants and horses and camels and war material that had been seized were recovered, and ¹seven famous elephants, out of those brought from Jājnagar, which Sultān Hūshang had acquired with such great hardship and trouble were obtained as booty. Sultān Ahmad then with victory and triumph betook himself to his pavilion, and bound up his wound. He then arranged a great public audience and did everything to please and encourage the *amīrs* and the heads of groups, and the brave warriors. On the next day, he sent Iftikhār-ul-mulk and Malīk Safdar Khān Sultānī, with a well-equipped detachment into the adjoining country, that they might guard the animals belonging to the camp which had been sent out to collect fodder. It so happened that a detachment of the enemy's army had come out of their camp to attack and harass the men who were collecting fodder. The two bodies met and attacked each other, and did everything to slay and be slain. In the end, Sultān Hūshang's detachment fled and retired to Sārangpūr and Malīk Iftikhār-ul-mulk and Safdar Khān Sultānī returned crowned with success and victory, and received favours from the Sultān.

Sultān Ahmad for reasons of state now started for Gujrāt on the 24th of Rabī'ul-ākhir of that year. Sultān Hūshang immediately sallied out of the fort of Sārangpūr, and started in pursuit. Sultān Ahmad turned back, and stood his ground, and the flames of battle blazed up between the two armies. Sultān Ahmad exerted himself with great gallantry. After much fighting and great struggle, Sultān Hūshang turned his back on the field of battle, and fled, and entered the fort. On this occasion also some of the Jājnagar elephants fell into the hands of the Gujrāt army. Sultān Ahmad halted that day at that place, and on the next day he again advanced in the direction of Ahmadābād. He arrived there on the 4th Jamādī-ul-

¹ One MS has *سبعة*, chain, after *سبعة*, seven, but the other and the lith ed do not have it. Ordinarily an elephant is described as *یک ریحیر فیل*. I suppose *یک سہ لہ فیل* also means an elephant.

abhir of that year and held great festive assemblies¹ and conferred distinctions on the *amirs* and the soldiers in the form of reward and robes of honour and increase of emoluments and as during this expedition the troops had lost much of their accoutrement he directed that they should not move for three years. The Sultan took up his residence in Ahmadabad and spent most of his time in inquiring into the cases of seekers of justice and regulating the administration of the kingdom and increasing the cultivation.

While he was so engaged the *amirs* represented to him that - Punja son of Ranmal the Raja of Idar had shortened his hand (i.e. had delayed) in remitting the tribute during the time when the Sultan was engaged in waging war in Malwa and having sent petitions to Sultan Hushang had tried to combine with him. Accordingly in the year 829 A.H. Sultan Ahmad sent a well equipped army to attack Punja. When the army arrived in the country of Idar and began to plunder and ravage it Punja met it with hostility and placed the shield of resistance before himself. When the struggle was protracted the Sultan advanced into Idar in person and planning the building of the city of Ahmadnagar on the bank of the river³ Hatmati at a distance of ten *karohs* from Idar laid the foundation

¹ There are different readings here. The reading in one MS which I have accepted is امر و سناغان را با نعام و احاب و رنادهی علوه اعمار بسد د، و حوس. The other MS has امر و سناغان در روز سناغان سناری سامان سده بودد. The reading in the lith ed is manifestly incorrect it has امر و سناغان را که سناری سامان سده بودد حلاج و انعام کلی داد بودد.

The name is written in the MSS as رنجا ولد رنمل and in the lith ed as رنجا بن راو مال. He is called Row Poonja in Ras Mala vol I page 349. It is difficult to ascertain the derivation or correct Sanskrit form of Punja. It may be Pujya the worshipped the honouree. Ranmal appears to be Rana Malla a athlete in war.

³ The name of the river is Sabarmati in the MSS in the lith ed of Firishtah and in the text edition but it is Hatmati in the lith ed. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 6) says Firishta writes Hatmutty it should evidently be Sabarmutty the same river that flows to Ahmadabad. In the map before me Ahmadnagar is not on the Sabarmati but on a stream which flows into it some distance to the south near a place which is called Cairah in the map. So I have retained Hatmati.

of a fort there. He made very great exertions in completing the building of it. He sent out detachments from Ahmadnagar, in different directions, all round Īdar, so that they might burn *tan o khushk* or wet and dry, i.e., growing crops, houses, etc., and slay all that fell into their hands. Pūnjā, although he saw all this, was determined to carry on the war. He sometimes appeared suddenly from a distance before a detachment which went to escort the men who went for fodder, and in the meantime, whenever he accidentally got a chance, he launched an attack.

In the end, when he found that he could effect nothing, and could not endure any longer the onslaughts of Ahmad Shāh's armies, he sent representatives, and with sincerity offered to pay a large tribute. But as he had (before this) several times broken his engagements, the Sultān did not accept his offer. He advanced in person against Īdar, and on the first day he seized three forts. Pūnjā fled and took shelter in the hills of ¹Visālnagar. The next day the Sultān sacked the city of Īdar and returned to Ahmadnagar. As the construction of Ahmadnagar was now completed, the Sultān in the following year, namely 830 A.H., again turned the bridle of his spirit to the conquest of the territory of Īdar, and sent his troops in all directions, so that they might plunder and ravage the country, and he himself also gave his attention to the work. Pūnjā in a state of great humility and distress sent emissaries and knocked at the door of peace, and agreed to pay a heavy tribute. As the Sultān had now formed a kingly determination to destroy him completely, he showed no favour to the words of the emissaries. Pūnjā, now utterly despondent, hovered moth-like round his territory, and wherever he could, made an onslaught. On a Thursday ² in the month of Jamādī-ul-ākhīr in the year 831 A.H., he came upon a detachment, which had gone to the jungle to escort a body of men who had gone to bring grass. After exerting himself a great deal against them, he fled, but when

¹ It is Bijānagar in the MSS and in the lith. ed., but the correct name appears to me to be Visālnagar, but I find that the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* also calls it Bijānagar. The reading in the MSS is followed in the text edition.

² So in the MSS and in the lith. ed., but Firishtah who has copied the sentence from the text *verbatim* has سبحم, 5th, instead of الاربعاء, Thursday, and this is apparently correct.

he was galloping away an elephant which had become separated from the detachment came into his view. He immediately turned round and wounding the animal with his spear drove it before him. As some brave men pursued him he betook himself into some uneven ground where there were caverns and ravines and by an accident his horse shied at the elephant and ¹ threw him into a cavern. Ahmad Shah's soldiers came up and turned the elephant back but they did not know that Punja had been thrown by his horse. About this time a poor man entered the cavern in order to collect fire wood. He saw a well dressed man lying dead and from his appearance concluded that it must be the corpse of a great man. He cut off his head and waited with it upon the Sultān and many people recognised it to be the head of Punja. They say that a man at that time saluted the head and showed great respect towards it. When people asked him the reason of this he said I served him for a long time. Sultān Ahmad was pleased with the man's good manners and rewarded him.

Couplet

Neglect not good manners and their results great
For in the end they will your fortune make

The next day the Sultān advanced to Idar and sending troops gave them orders to devastate Idar and Visalnagar. ² Har Ray the son of Punja having through the intervention of ³ Khan Jahan Sultān begged for the pardon of his offences and engaged to pay an annual tribute of three lakhs of silver *tanlas*. Sultān Ahmad on account of his great generosity and humanity drew the pen of

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have *انباد* but the other MS. has *انداحب*. I have accepted the latter reading for it does not appear that the dead horse was found near Punja's corpse. The circumstances under which Punja was killed are given somewhat differently by Firsihtah. Col Briggs does not say anything about the manner of his death. According to Ras Mala vol I p. 349 Punja fell under his horse and was killed.

² So in the MS. and in the lith. ed. Firsihtah (lith. ed.) has *برائو*. P. rau. Col Briggs does not give his name while the Ras Mala has Naron Das Bayley (p. 119) calls him Bir Rai but says he is called Har Rao in some MSS. He is called Har Rai in the Cambridge History of India page 298 and is said to have been reduced to vassalage by Sultan Ahmad in 1488.

³ One MS. has *Khan Jahan Sultani* and this is followed

forgiveness across his offences, and took him into the circle of his loyal adherents. He conferred the title of Safdar-ul-mulk on Malik Hasar and left him with a large body of troops in charge of the military post of Ahmadnagar. He then trampled over and plundered the country of ¹ Kilwāra, and went to Ahmadabad. He made the citizens fortunate with rewards and favours. After some days, Malik Muqarrar gave letters, addressed to Har Rāy, to some of his personal adherents, for the payment of their wages. When these men arrived at Īdar Har Rāy made delays in the payment of the money and passed the time making evasions. He then got the news that the Sultān had come out of the city, and was engaged in collecting troops. In great fear he fled and took shelter in an out-of-the-way place. When this news reached the Sultān he ² advanced on the wings of speed on the 4th Safar, 832 A H, and on the 6th Safar, he took up his residence in the fort, and after performing the rites of offering thanks to God, planned the erection of a *gāma' masjid*, and leaving a large force there went to Ahmadnagar.

³ In 833 A H, when ⁴ Rāja Kānhā, the Rāja of Jhālāwār, knew that Sultān Ahmad had nearly finished the matter of Īdar, and that

¹ So in the MSS and in the lith ed. Firishtah (lith ed.) has ككواره, Kankwāra. Col Briggs has Gilwara and Rās Mālā has Gudwārā.

² Instead of the peaceful march to, and entry into Īdar, described in the text, Firishtah says یکی از فلاح معتبر آید متوج ساحتہ نقلہ درآمد, and Rās Mālā, vol I, p. 350, follows him and says "he carried by storm one of the principal forts in that province, wherein he built a magnificent mosque."

³ Bayley says (page 114), that for some reason, the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī gives only a brief summary of the latter years of Sultān Ahmād's reign, and he has supplied the deficiency by extracts from the Tabakāt-i-Akbarī. As regards the war between Sultān Ahmad of Gujārāt and Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī no additional information can be obtained from the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī.

⁴ So in the MSS and in the lith ed. In the lith ed. of Firishtah he is changed to two Rājas راجہ کانبہ و راجہ حالوارہ Rāja Kānhā and Rāja of Jālāwārāh, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 26) has Kanha Ray, the Raja of Jhalode. According to the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī his proper name was Kānhā Satarsāl, Rāja of Jhālāwār. He had joined the rebellion of 1413 and had therefore good reason for being afraid of Sultān Ahmad's displeasure towards him. The rebellion of Kānhā is also mentioned in the Cambridge History of India, page 296, where it is said that it called "Ahmad into Kāthiāwār."

as soon as he would be free he would attack other *amindars* he considered that it would be most advantageous for him to leave his own country and he accordingly fled. The force which was deputed to punish him went in pursuit of him into the territory of Asir and Burhānpur. Nasir Khan the ruler of Asir on account of the fact that Kanha had presented ¹ two worn out elephants as tribute to him and exchanging the rights for benefits conferred for injuries gave him a place (i.e. an asylum) in his kingdom. After some days Kanha went to Gulbarga ² and brought a force from Sultan Ahmad Bahmani to assist and help him after which he plundered and ravaged parts of Nādarbar.

When this news reached Sultan Ahmad he appointed his eldest son Shahzādā Muḥammad Khan to inquire into and redress this matter and sent great *sardars* such as Sayyid Abul Khayr and ⁴ Sayyid Qasim son of Sayyid Ālam and Malik Muqarrab Ahmad Āyaz and Malik Iftikhar ul mulk with him. Shahzādā Muḥammad Khan fought a battle with the Dakini troops and gained the victory and a large number of the Dakinis were slain and others were taken prisoners. The remainder who escaped the sword fled to Daulatabad. When this intelligence reached Sultan Ahmad Bahmani he sent his eldest son Sultan Ala ud din and his second son Khan Jahan to carry on the war with Shahzādā Muhammad. He also entrusted the

¹ One MS. has دو میل لکاب the other has دو میل معکوک. The lith. ed. has دو میل رگار. Firishtah has دو میل لکاب معکوک. Col Briggs says (vol. IV pp. 76-77) Kanha presented two elephants which he had succeeded in bringing with him when he escaped from a detachment which was sent in pursuit of him. Bayley (p. 116) in his translation of the Tabakat has two large elephants but says in a note some MSS. have one.

The sentence in the text حقو نربس معقو عدل ساحه is obscure and cryptic. Firishtah is more intelligible. He says او با حقو نربس با ساحل and he (i.e. Nāsir Khan) relying on the strength (he felt) from the fact of his relationship with the badshahs of the Dakin exchanged the rights which the Sultan of Gujrat had on him for benefits he had conferred for injuries.

² Firishtah says specially that it was a small detachment.

⁴ The names are somewhat different in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. Sayyid Qasim is called Sayyid Abul Qasim. Sayyid Ālam is not mentioned as the father of Sayyid Qasim but as a separate chief.

affairs of the army to the judgment of Qadī Khān, who was one of the great *amīns* of the Deccan. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, in consultation with Qadī Khān, arrived by successive marches at Daulatābād, and took up his residence there. At this station, Naṣīr Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, and Kānhā Rāja of Jhālāwār also joined the camp of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and he was much strengthened by them. Muhammad Khān also advanced towards Daulatābād with the intention of giving battle. When the two armies approached each other closely, Muhammad Khān arrayed his ranks, and the fire of ¹ battle flamed up from both sides. At this juncture Malik Muqarrab Ahmad Āyāz and Qadī Khān, both of whom were commanders, fought hand to hand. Qadr Khān fell from the back of his horse on the dust of destruction. Malik Iftikhār-ul-mulk seized a large elephant as booty. Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn fled and took shelter in the fort of Daulatābād. Naṣīr Khān, the ruler of Asīr, also fled, and went to the hills of ² Kaland, which are situated in the country of Asīr. Muhammad Khān carried out the customs of offering thanks to God, and as he knew that it would be impossible to capture the fort of Daulatābād, he returned from there, and having trampled down a part of the territory of Asīr and Burhānpūr, took up his quarters in the town of Nadarbār. From that place he notified the true state of things to his father. Sultān Ahmad wrote in reply that he should continue for a few days longer at Nadarbār, in order to arrange and regulate the affairs of that quarter.

In the year 834 A H ³ Qutb, the officer-in-charge of the island of Mahām, and other sufferers (*mehnat zadhā*) sent a petition to

¹ This battle is said, in the Cambridge History of India, page 299, to have taken place at Mānikpunj about 38 miles N -W of Daulatābād.

² One MS has گولکند, Gōlkund, which is clearly a mistake. The other has کلند, Kaland. The lith ed has کلید, Kalīd. The lith ed of Firishtah has Kaland. Col Briggs simplifies matters by saying (vol II, p 28) "took refuge in the hills of Kandeish".

³ He is called Qutb without any addition, in the MSS and in the lith ed, and in the lith ed of Firishtah. Col Briggs, however, calls him Kootb Khan. Firishtah's account, however, differs from that in the text inasmuch as he says that it was after the death of Qutb, that Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, who was always thinking of retaliating for his previous defeat, sent the Malik-ut-tujār, and the latter took possession of the island. In the Tārīkh 1-Alfī Qutb is called Rāi

Sultān Ahmad that Malik ¹ Hasan who had the title of Malik ut tujjar and was one of the *amirs* of Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī had come from the country of the Deccan and had seized the island of Mahaim and neighbouring country with great violence and ferocity and had ravaged a Musalman country and had carried Musalmans away in bondage Sultān Ahmad sent Shahzada Zafar Khan to destroy Malik ut tujjar and he appointed some great *amirs* who had previously done (great) deeds to serve under him He also wrote to Mukhlis ul mulk the *lotual* of Dīb (Diu) that he should get the ships belonging to the different ports and should proceed to attend on Zafar Khan Malik Mukhlis ul mulk fitted out seven hundred ships large and small from the town of Pattan and ³ the Port of Dīb and the district of ⁴ Kambayat He came and waited upon Zafar Khan in the neighbourhood of the country of Mahaim It was decided in consultation with the *amirs* ⁵ that the ships should be sent to the country of Thana and he should himself remain with Zafar Khan

When they arrived near Thana Zafar Khan sent Iftikhar ul mulk and Malik Suhrab Sultānī in advance to surround that country At the same time the ships filled with armed men arrived by sea and closed the approach (by sea) When Zafar Khan began to conquer that district the governor of Thana sallied out of the fort and fought with bravery He was however unable to withstand the onslaughts of the Gujrat army and fled The Shahzada with the advice of the *amirs* left a body of troops there and advanced on Mahaim Malik

Qutb and Bayley thinks that He was the Ra of Mahaim whose daughter Prince Fath Khan is said in the sequel to have married He was probably one of the petty local princes It is said in Ras Mala page 300 vol I that he was a tributary Hindoo prince with the title of Raee who afterwards gave a daughter to the harem of the son of Shah Ahmed

¹ For an account of him see the history of the reign of Ahmad Shah Bahmanī p 49 onwards

According to Firishtah and Col Briggs and Ras Mala (vol I p 30) there were only seventeen ships

³ One MS has بندر گھوگا Bandar Ghogah instead of *Ban-lar Dīp* but Bayley p 117 has both Diu and the port of Ghogah

⁴ کنبای Kanbayat in the text-edition

⁵ Col Briggs's translation is slightly different It is that the ships with part of the army should go to Tanna and the remainder should go by land

ut-tujjār had cut down large trees, and had built a barricade with the branches along the shore of Mahāim. When the Gujrāt army came up, Malik-ut-tujjār came outside the barricade and fought with gallantry. From the approach of the light of dawn to the setting of the sun, the brave men of the two armies showed no deficiency in courage and hardihood. But in the end, Malik-ut-tujjār fled and got within the barricade. When the ships arrived, and the Gujrāt army had the command both by sea and land, Malik-ut-tujjār sent a petition to Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and prayed for help. The Sultān sent ten thousand horsemen, and ¹ sixty and odd *mast* elephants with two of his sons from Daulatābād, and sent his *vazīr* Khān Jahān with them, so that they might act according to his advice and counsel. When the Deccan army arrived near Mahāim, Malik-ut-tujjār being assured of the safety of the island and of the barricades of trees, had the honour of waiting on the two Shāhzādas. After much discussion, it was decided, that they should in the first instance endeavour to recover possession of the district of Thāna, and they started in the direction of that place.

Shāhzāda Zafar Khān also made necessary preparations, and started to re-inforce the men at Thāna. After the two armies had met (near Thāna), they fought with each other from morning till sun-set, and in the end, defeat fell on the Deccan army. Malik-ut-tujjār fled to ² Jālna, and his troops, for fear of their lives, abandoned the island of Mahāim. Zafar Khān crowned with success and victory landed there, and sent out ships, and seized some of the officers of Malik-ut-tujjār, who had fled by way of the sea. He despatched some boats after ³ filling them with various kinds of rich fabrics and

¹ Both MSS have *چند و شصت و سه*, sixty and odd. The lith ed has *شصت و سه* sixty. Bayley, p 117, has *sixty odd*, but Firishtah has *چند و شصت و سه* sixty and odd, Col Briggs (vol IV, p 29) has *sixty*.

² The MSS, the lith ed have *حاله*. Bayley, p 118, has *Jālناه*. Firishtah has *حاكنه*, (which does not differ very much from *حاله*) but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 30) says, he fled to Chakun.

³ The passage is somewhat obscure. The MSS and the lith ed have *ار اقسام اومسه و تنگهای بار چند کشتی بر کرده*. Bayley, p 118, has translated the passage, "Several ships were loaded with stuffs and clothes and precious stones." Firishtah has *در سرچ*. Col Briggs has "Some beautiful gold and silver-embroidered muslins." Rās Mālā has the words as Col Briggs, and puts them

tanḳas as offerings to Sultān Ahmad. He took possession of the entire district of Mahaim and divided it among the *amirs* and the heads of different groups of people.

When all the effects reached the ear of Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī he was extremely depressed and equipped his army in order to revenge himself and marched against the country of ¹Baglana which is near the port of Surat. Shahzādā Muhammad Khān who was in the country of Nadarbar and Sultanpur sent a representation to his father to the effect that he had been deprived of the honour of serving His Majesty for a period of four years and some months and on account of this long residence of his in a distant land the retainers of the *amirs* and *khans* had gone away to their own countries and a large force had not been left there. He also said that he had heard that Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī had marched into the country of Baglana and intended to advance in the direction of Nadarbar.

When this representation reached the Sultān he postponed the siege of Champnir to some other time and advanced towards Nadot and after plundering and ravaging that country advanced by successive marches and encamped in the vicinity of the town of Nadarbar. Shahzādā Muhammad Khān and the *amirs* who were with him had the honour of offering their services and each one of them received a special favour in accordance with his rank and position. The spy brought the news at that station in the year 835 A.H. that Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī on receiving the information of the arrival of the Sultān (Ahmad Gujrātī) had left a detachment on the boundary of his kingdom and had gone back to Gulbarga. The Sultān was pleased and delighted on hearing this news and turned back towards Ahmadabad. He had crossed the Tiptī after successive marches when

between inverted commas. It is shown that they have been taken from Col Briggs's History. The difficulty in the passage lies in the words سنگهای which I am inclined to translate as *tanḳas* but which Bayley has translated as precious stones. The word does not occur in Firishtah so he can be left out of account. As between *tanḳas* and precious stones I have never seen the latter called سنگی. They are always called حواهر. Firishtah's *ṛī goll* may mean gold and red *tanḳas*.

¹ نکلاند instead of نکلاند in the text edition.

² بنی Patni in the text edition.

news arrived that Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī had again besieged the fort of ¹ Tambōl, and Malik Sa'ādat Sultānī was leaving nothing undone in bravely defending it. Immediately on receipt of this news, he turned back, and advanced on wings of speed towards Tambōl. When Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī became aware of this fact, he cheered and encouraged a body of *pāiks*, with robes of honour and great rewards, and told them, "Reinforcements are coming to the garrison. If to-night ² you will play a great game, so that the hand of my hope should reach the skirts of success, I shall give you such rewards, that you will never again be in want." When a part of the night had passed, the *pāiks* went to the foot of the fort, and slowly and silently under the shelter of the rocks, climbed to the top of the rampart and dropped into the fort. They wanted to open the gates, but Malik Sa'ādat Sultānī, being on the alert, fell upon them, and slew most of them. Those who escaped the sword threw themselves from the ramparts and perished. Malik Sa'ādat Sultānī did not consider this sufficient, but opening the gate, he made a sudden attack on a battery which was in front of it. The men in the battery, who were asleep, were most of them wounded.

At this time the Sultān of Gujrāt approached near, and Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī leaving the foot of the fort, advanced to meet him. He summoned his *amīrs* and the commanders of his army and told them, "The armies of Gujrāt have several times defeated the armies of the Deccan, and they have also taken possession of Mahāim. If this time also, I show inactivity and am defeated, I shall lose the Deccan altogether." He then arrayed the ranks of his army, and took up a position on the battlefield. Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī also came, and met him with his armies arranged for battle, and there was a

¹ Called Batnol in the Cambridge History of India, page 299

² The words are somewhat obscure. The MSS have نقسى يافتد, and the lith ed has نقسى يافتد. The lith ed of Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has نقسى يافتد. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 31) calls the *pāiks* "Naigs", but he does not translate the Shah's words to them. Bayley has *pāiks*, and he says immediate action is necessary, but it is not clear what meaning he has given to the words in question. I have adopted نقسى يافتد, while the text edition has نقسى يافتد.

terrible conflict ¹ Daud Khān who was one of the great *amirs* of the Deccan having challenged the Gujrati *amir* was taken prisoner by Add ul mulk. The two armies fought together and showed great gallantry. When evening came both sounded the drum of return and turned back to their respective encamping grounds. As large numbers of the Dākini army had been slain Sultan Ahmad Bahmani in great distress took the path of flight.

The next day Sultan Ahmad entered the fort of Tambol and showed great favour to Malik Saadat Sultan and leaving a detachment to reinforce him started towards ² Talnir and having rebuilt the fort there ³ plundered and ravaged the towns and villages. He conferred the title of Mu'in ul mulk on Malik Taj ud din and ⁴ directed that he should remain there. He then returned to Ahmadabad by Sultanpur and Nadarbar. After a few days he brought the daughter of the Ray of Maham into the bond of wedlock with Shahzada Fath Khan.

(It appears in my mind) that in the *Tarikh-i Bahmani* the story of the siege of the fort of Tambol has been narrated in a different way from what my double tongued pen has described in the section about the Dākin. (It may be said here) in brief that as the period of the siege was protracted to two years Sultan Ahmad Shah Gujrati

¹ The name is Daud in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in Bayley's translation. But Firishlah says that it was اردو خان Azhar Khan who challenged the Gujrati *amir* and Col Briggs calls him Azhar Khan a young Deccany nobleman (see IV p 31).

نابور instead of نالبر in the text edition

² The MSS have بلاد و دهب را ناح و ناراج کرد but the lith ed has دهب ان بلاد را ناراج کرده. Firishlah who copies the *Tabaqat* frequently word for word has in the corresponding passage نادوب و امامت و ناراج نموده. This last version appears to me to be the best but I have retained the words of the MSS بلاد دهب را without conjunction و in the text edition.

³ The reading in the MSS and in the lith ed which is ملک ناح الدس را appears to me to be incomplete. I would insert some word like فرمود که or معنی کرد که between داد and ابعا ماند.

⁴ The word is قصد and قصد in the two MSS and قصد in the lith ed. Firishlah has قصد in the corresponding passage and this is followed in the text edition.

in the way of kindness and friendship, sent an ambassador to wait upon Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and made a request through him, that this fort might be left in his possession. Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī did not accept this proposal. In the end, Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī marched straight from the bounds of his kingdom and invaded the Deccan, in order to have his revenge, and commenced to plunder and ravage it, and Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī had no further opportunity for besieging it. It appears to my mind, that the author of the *Tārīkh-i-Bahmanī* has not narrated the facts in a plain, straightforward manner, and what is narrated in the history of Gujrāt is nearer the truth.

In the month of Rajab in the year 836 AH (1432 AD), the Sultān advanced to conquer the countries of ¹ Mewār and Nāgōr, and when he arrived in the town of ² Harpūr, he sent his troops and plundered and ravaged the towns and villages, and he levelled to the dust any temple that came anywhere into his view. After some days, he encamped in the town of Dūngarpūr, and ³ Ganēsā, the Rāja of the place fled, but later feeling ashamed and repentant, came and waited on the Sultān, and becoming enlisted in the band of his dependants, paid a suitable tribute. Sultān Ahmad Shāh then trampled down and ravaged the country of Kīlwāra, and then invaded Dīlwāra, and having rased to the dark ground the palaces and other structures of ⁴ Rānā Mūkul, the Rāja of Dīlwāra, which had lifted up their

¹ In the translation of this part of the *Tabakāt*, given in Bayley, p. 120, the name of Kōlīwārah is inserted after Mewār and Nāgōr. Firishtah in the lith ed. has *مدوات و ناگور*, and Col Briggs also has towards Nagoor and Mewat. Mēwāt seems to be a mistake for Mēwār. Rās Mālā says, he marched into Rajpootana.

² The MSS. have *برپور* Barpūr and *هرپور* Harpūr, the lith ed. has *سبرپور* Sabzpūr, and Bayley, p. 120, has Sidhpur. Firishtah does not mention the place, and at once takes Sultān Ahmad to Dūngarpūr.

³ The name is *گنہا* in the MSS., and *کدیسای* in the lith ed. Bayley has Ganesā. Firishtah does not mention any name, but says the Sultān extorted tribute from the *zamīndārs* of the place. Col Briggs has Raja, and Rās Mālā has Rāwul. *کدیا* in the text edition.

⁴ With reference to Rānā Mūkul the lith ed. of Firishtah has *ولایت کیلوارہ* و *دیلوارہ* کہ *بعلی برانا موکل داشت*. Col Briggs paraphrases Kīlwāra and Dīlwāra as the country of the Kolies and Bheels. Rās Mālā has "the country of the Bheels."

heads to the sky (with pride) demolished the temples and destroyed the idols. He also had some turbulent men who had fallen into his hands executed ¹ by throwing them under the feet of elephants. He left Malik Mir Sultān in those places for the purpose of collecting *khiraj* (tribute) and turned to the country of the Rathors. The

Rathor chiefs offered him allegiance and paid tribute and behaved with loyalty. ³ Firuz Khan the son of Shams Khan Dundani and the nephew of Sultān Muẓaffar who was the ruler of Nagor came and waited upon the Sultan and brought some *lakhs* of *tanḡas* as tribute. ⁴ Sultan Ahmad gave back the tribute and leaving a body of troops in certain *mahals* of Mawas in the way of a military outpost returned to Ahmadabad. As on every occasion when the Sultan returned from journeys and wars he held grand festive assemblies and conferred distinctions on each of the *amirs* and other soldiers who had performed commendable services by the grant of rewards and favours and increase in their stipends and promotions in their ranks and also granted kingly favours on all the inhabitants of the country of Gujrat both great and small and Shaikhs and deserving persons on this occasion also he arranged a similar festive assembly and conferred new favours on every deserving person.

In the year 839 A H news came from the country of Mūlwa that Mahmud Khan the son of Malik Maghith who had been the *viceroy* of Sultān Hushang had murdered Ghazni Khan the Shihzada who had after the death of Sultān Hushang succeeded him by giving poison to him and having raised the standard of his own rule had taken the name

¹ I do not exactly understand the words which I have translated by throwing them etc. They are *بی ستر فلان گردانید* in the MSS and *بی ستر فلان گردانید* in the lith ed. Firishtah has no corresponding passage.

Instead of Rathor chiefs Firishtah in the lith ed. has *و حوں بولاب صواب و لعمہ و نار نالاد و لاسی زب و ار ما زان ناح و حراج گوب*. Col Briggs (vol IV p 329) has the rays of Kota Boondi and Nowlaya and Ras Mala (p 321) has the Rows of Kotah Boond and Nudoolave.

³ This is also mentioned by Firishtah and also by Col Briggs but neither of them says anything about the leaving of the military outpost in certain Mahals of Mawas.

⁴ The Cambridge History of India page 299 mentions the question of an indemnity from Firuz Khan but does not say that it was given back to him.

of Sultān Mahmūd At the same time, Masa'ūd Khān, the Shāhzāda of Mālwa, fled from his own country, and came (to Sultān Ahmad) for protection The Sultān advanced with a well-equipped army, and ¹ took possession of the greater part of the country of Mālwa, and intended to place Shāhzāda Masa'ūd Khān on the throne of his great ancestors At this time, by a strange mischance, a great pestilence made its appearance in Sultān Ahmad's army, so that people had no time for placing the dead into shrouds, and for burying them In the course of two days some thousands of people died, and the Sultān himself having been attacked, had against his wishes to return to Gujiāt He gave hopes of being able to help Masa'ūd Khān in the course of the next year The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in greater detail in the section about Mālwa

Fate did not give a further lease of life to Sultān Ahmad, and he passed away on the ² 4th of Rabī'-ul-ākhir in the year 846 A H (4th July 1443 A D) He was born in the metropolitan city of Dehli on the night of Friday the 19th of Dhī-hijjah in the year 793 A H , and this has been referred to on a preceding page ³ They say that from the time of his attaining to majority, till the time of his death, he had never omitted to perform the prescribed religious duties He

¹ Firishtah narrates the different operations of the campaign, and it appears from what he says that Sultān Ahmad was not so successful as Nizām-ud dīn wants to make out In fact according to Firishtah, Sultān Mahmūd (the usurper) was well able to withstand the Gujiāt forces, as well as those raised by 'Umar Khān, a son of Sultān Hūshang It appears from Firishtah that there was famine in the Gujiāt camp before the plague broke out, while Sultān Mahmūd was well provided with food and ammunition As to the plague (وبا) Firishtah says that it rarely occurs in India (ووبا که در هندوستان کم تر باشد) Col Briggs has a note about this (p 34, vol IV), the meaning of which is not quite clear to me The Cambridge History of India, page 299, calls Mahmūd Khaljī a cousin of Ghaznī Khān

² The Cambridge History of India, page 300, gives August 16th, 1442, as the date of his death

³ There are some differences in the readings One MS has after هرگز طریقه بادشاه بسدیده اطوار و مائل بطاعت بود , ارو و صا بسد The other MS omits the sentence from بادشاه to بود The lith ed has after مدفون گشت گوید بادشاه بسدیده و یک کردار بود I have adopted the reading of the first MS

was a *badshah* of agreeable manners just and god fearing He attained to sovereignty in his 22nd year and he ruled his kingdom for 32 years and six months and twenty days He was buried in the centre of Ahmadabad After his death he has been mentioned in letters and *farman*s as *Khudāgan Maghfur* (the pardoned Lord)

AN ACCOUNT OF GHĪYAS UD DUNIYĀ WAD DĪN MUHAMMAD
SHAH, SON OF AHMAD SHĀH

When a two or three days mourning was over the *amirs* and the *ra'is* and the great men of the city and the well known men of the kingdom placed Shahzada Muhammad Khan on the throne of the empire on the 7th of Rabī ul akhīr in the year 846 A H (7th July 1443 A D) and gave him the title of Ghīyas ud duniyā wad dīn Muhammad Shāh The ceremonies of offering presents and thank offerings were carried out The gold that was showered over the royal umbrella was distributed among the meritorious people The Sultān conferred distinctions on the *amirs* and the great men of the kingdom by conferring titles and high appointments on them From the time of his accession the kingdom gained a new grandeur and greater splendour He opened his hands with such liberality that the common people gave him the name of Muhammad Shāh ³ *Zar bakhsh* i.e. the giver of gold On the 20th Ramādan in the year 849 A H Muhammad Shah had a son born to him and the prince

¹ In the text edition *اور* *اور* three days only is adopted

² The *Mirat-i Sikandari* (Bayley page L-5) gives 845 A H as the year of the accession of Muhammad Shah but his coin (see Thomas *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi* page 33) gives the name and title as it is given in the text and the date of the accession as the 3rd Rabī ul akhīr 846 The *Mirat-i Sikandari* (Bayley p. 19) gives him credit for his liberality but says he gave himself up to pleasure and ease but the capacity of his understanding did not attain to the lofty heights of the concerns of the state

³ There is a very great difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizam ud dīn and by Firhtah respectively According to the latter it was in the year of the accession and not after three years that Muhammad Shah invaded Idar and espoused the Ray's daughter According to Bayley (p. 19) the version in the *Tabakat-i* probably correct The *Cambridge History of India* page 300 says Muhammad Shah was surnamed *Karīm* or the Generous This is scarcely correct He was popularly called *Zarbakhsht* and after his death he was called *Khudāgan Karīm*

received the name of Mahmūd Khān. The Sultān gave grand entertainments, and conferred rewards and favours on the *amīns* and the great men of the kingdom.

After the time of the entertainments was over, in the same year he advanced to the country of Īdar, in order to devastate it, and he did not omit a single *minutia* in the practices of plunder and rapine. ¹ Rāy Harī, son of Pūnjā, Rāja of Īdar, came forward in great distress, and brought his daughter in the shape of tribute. That lady owing to her great beauty kept Muhammad Shāh bound to her by her personal charm. After some days she prayed that the fort of Īdar might be bestowed on her father. The Sultān gave the fort of Īdar to Har Rāy and advanced towards the country of ² Bākūr, and Ganēsā, the Rāja of Dūngarpūr, fled and concealed himself in the caverns in the ³ hilly country. When he saw that the country was suffering from the ravages of calamities, he came out, and through the intervention of ⁴ Malīk Mīr Sultānī, who had the title of Khān Jahān did homage to the Sultān, and having paid tribute kept his kingdom in safety. From that place Sultān Muhammad Shāh returned to Ahmadābād. ⁵ He advanced in the year 853 A H, (1449 A D), to

¹ The Cambridge History of India here calls the son of Pūnjā, Rāja Bīr, though on page 298 it had called him Harī Rāi. Earlier, Har Rāy (*vide* p. 211).

² It is written as باکور in the MSS, and is so printed in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not mention the place. Bayley (p. 130) has Bāgor. According to the Cambridge History of India, page 300, "Muhammad next attacked at Bāgor, Rānā Kūmbha of Mewār, who fled and took refuge with the Rāwal of Dūngarpur, the chief of his house, but afterwards appeared before the invader, and purchased peace with a heavy indemnity." This does not agree with the text, according to which it was Ganēsā of Dūngarpūr, (and not Kūmbhā of Mewār) who paid the tribute. In the text-edition the name of the King is کیا.

³ One MS inserts وہنگل after کوہستان.

⁴ ملک مدر in the text-edition.

⁵ I have already noted that there is considerable difference between the accounts of this reign as given by Nizām ud-dīn and by Firishtah. According to the latter the expedition to Chāmpānīr took place in 954 A H and not in 953 A H. The Rāja of Chāmpānīr is called کانگداس, Kangdās in the lith. ed. of Firishtah and Gangadas by Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 35). The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls him Gangādās, but the name can only be transliterated as Kankdās, Kangdās, or Gangdās and not as Gangādās. He is said after the

conquer the fort of Champaur and when by successive marches he arrived in its neighbourhood Ray Kank Dis the Rajā sallied out of the fort with his men and fought bravely but in the end he fled and re-entered the fort. Sulṭān Muhammad blockaded the fort from all sides and employed all his energy in capturing it. Ray Kank Dis sought the intervention of Sulṭān Mahmud Khalji and asking him to his aid agreed to pay a *lakh* of *tanḳas* at every stage as a contribution towards his expenses. Sulṭān Mahmud Khalji being tempted by the money advanced to help and support him. When he arrived in the town of Dahud Sulṭān Muhammad rising from the foot of the fort

battle to have been driven into the hill fortresses of Pavagarh (?) Pavangar the fort of the wind. Then as regards the invasion of Sulṭān Mahmud Khalji Firishtah says that as soon as Sultan Muhammad heard of it he set fire to his surplus tents and other equipage because many of the beasts of burden in his camp had perished on account of hard work and there was also a certain amount of faint heartedness and commenced to retire. And although his *amirs* incited him to carry on the war he did not agree and retired with precipitation towards Ahmadabad. Then when the Sultan of Malwa again advanced with a hundred thousand men to conquer Gujrat Sultan Muhammad could not be induced by his *amirs* to fight against him and in fact wanted to flee to Dip. Then the *amirs* went to his wife and asked her whether she wanted that her husband should live or that Gujrat should be lost to the dynasty. The queen had to agree and the *amirs* gave him poison in his food and he was killed on the 7th of Muharram 80 A H.

His reign according to Firishtah extended to eight years and nine months and fourteen days. Col Briggs (vol IV p 36) reduces the period of his reign by ten days and says in a note that according to the Moontakhib oot Towareekh he died on the 10th Muharram A H 80 10th February 1411.

Bayley (p 13) says that the Sultan asked the advice of a *bakal* or grain dealer and the latter advised him to place his treasures and family on board ships and amuse himself with fishing. The Sultan accepted this advice and commenced secretly to make his preparations but Said Ala ul lah one of the great nobles came to know of this and asked the *bakal* why he gave such advice. The man replied that as the Sultan did not ask the advice of the *amirs* but of a man like him he gave him such advice as he considered best. Then Said Ala ul lah told the King's son what his father intended to do and asked him what he would do if he was in his father's place. The prince said he would fight for his kingdom and if necessary die on the battlefield. Then the son was given to Sultan Muhammad (pp 133 134).

The Cambridge History of India page 301 says nothing about poison being given to the Sultan and says he died on the 10th February 1411.

retired towards Ahmadābad He halted in the village of ¹ Kothiah, and busied himself with the mustering of troops, and the collection of materials of war and of the arms and weapons of offence Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī also stopped at the place where he had arrived, and did not advance any further

In the month of Muharram 855 A H , Sultān Muhammad Shāh accepted the summons of the just God After his death in formal matters people have written of him as *Khudāigān Karīm* (the merciful Lord) The period of his rule was seven years and nine months and four days

² AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN QUTB-UD-DĪN AHMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF AHMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF MUZAFFAR SHĀH

The *amīns* and the great men carried out the rites of mourning for three days, and then on the 4th day, which was the ³ 11th of Muharram in the year 855 A H , they placed the eldest son of Sultān Muhammad Shāh, who was in his twentieth year, on the throne of empire, and they gave him the title of Sultan Qutb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh His name is Ahmad but he is celebrated by his title At the time of his accession, they carried out the rite of *Nithar*, wave offering, and they distributed the gold to the deserving men of the country of Gujrāt, and made them happy and contented He made the *amīns* and the great men of the kingdom happy by royal gifts, and titles and high appointments

¹ The place is called Godhra in the Cambridge History of India, page 301, and it is said there, that Muhammad in spite of his illness advanced as far as Godhra to meet Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī and the latter on hearing this retired to Mandū

² The headings in the MSS , and in the lith ed , all give the whole genealogy Firsihtah has a shorter heading ذکر سادات سامان قطب الدین بن محمد ساه گجراتی

³ Firsihtah does not mention the date of the accession, but Col Briggs (vol IV p 37) says indirectly that he was born on the 8th of Jumad-ooos Sany, 855 A H , and he ascended the throne in the 49th year of his age As a matter of fact he was born on the 12th Jamādī-ul ākhir, 835 A H and ascended the throne in his 20th year

It so happened that when Sultān Muhammad Shah died and Sultān Qutb ud dīn took his place Sultān Mahmud Khālji who had come to aid the Ray of Chāmpānūr ¹ and was still on the boundary of Gujrat thinking that (the conquest of the country) would be within his power advanced into the country with great rapidity. On the day on which he arrived in the neighbourhood of Baroda a *maṣṭ* elephant belonging to his army entered the village of Barnāma. The *zunnardars* (Brahmans) of Barnāma killed the elephant and the driver. The Sultān was amazed at the boldness of the *raiyats* and ordered that in revenge the town of Barnāma should be destroyed.

As it was yet the beginning of the reign of Qutb ud dīn and Sultān Mahmud had invaded the country with great strength and violence ² Sultān Qutb ud dīn consulted with a *baqal* (grain dealer) who held a position of great proximity (to his person) in his service. The *baqal* said: The best course would be that the Sultān should withdraw into the country of Sorath. When Sultān Mahmud should go back to his own country after leaving an army in Gujrat the Sultān would be able to drive away those troops with ease. Sultān Qutb ud dīn made inquiries of the truth of this and wanted to act accordingly. The *amirs* however did not allow him to do so but took him along to carry on the war. When they gained the victory

¹ Contrary to what is stated in the text the Cambridge History of India page 301 say Sultan Mahmud Khālji advanced from Mandu with an army of one hundred thousand horse and five hundred elephants.

One MS and the lith ed have برودرة Barodra while the other MS has برود Baroda. I have adopted Baroda which is the name by which the place is known though I have heard that Barodra is the correct ancient name.

² The story of the *baqal* is mentioned by Firishtah in much the same language as in the text. Col Briggs gives a slightly different version in which he says that the Sultan was advised by some of his courtiers to retreat to Sorat (in a note We term Guzerat called also Kattywar) and allow the king of Malwa to occupy for the present the eastern provinces etc. It will be remembered (see note page 225) that in the Mirat-i-Sikandari a *bakal* is said to have given somewhat similar advice to Sultan Muhammad the father of Sultan Qutb ud dīn. The Mirat-i-Sikandari does not say that Sultan Qutb ud dīn sought the advice of the *baqal* but apparently a *baqal* was consulted either by the father or by the son.

they were angry with the *baqāl* and questioned him. He said, "If the Sultān had the wish to fight, he would have consulted you. As he wanted to flee he asked me."

In short Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn met Sultān Mahmūd in the village of ¹ Kaparbanj which is twenty *larōhs* from Ahmadābād. At this place ² Malik 'Alā'-ud-dīn Suhrāb, who was the *thāmadān* of Sultānpūr, and who had been compelled to join Sultān Mahmūd, fled from him, and waited on Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn. He was honoured by having seven robes of honour conferred on him in the course of a day, and received the title of 'Alā'-ul-mulk. As there was now a distance of three *larōhs* between the two armies, Sultān Mahmūd wrote this couplet and sent it to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn

¹ The name is کپر بنج and کبر بنج in the MSS. and کبر بنج in the lith. ed. The correct name appears to be کپر بنج Kaparbanj. The Cambridge History of India, page 301 calls it Kapadvanj کپر بنج in the text edition.

² Bayley (p. 135) quoting from the *Tūīkh-i-Bahādur Shāhī* says that 'Alā'-ud-dīn "shut the gate of the fort (of Sultānpūr) in his face and opened fire both with guns and musketry. Mahmūd Khilji besieged the place for seven days. After that through the mediation of Mubārak Khān, son of Ahmad Shāh and uncle of Kutb ud dīn, who had gone to Sultān Mahmūd at Mandū during the previous reign, and had joined his court", he surrendered the fort, and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khilji's service. When asked to swear allegiance to the latter, he swore it in an evasive language. The Cambridge History of India, page 301, calls the fort Nadarbār (or Nandurbār and not Sultānpūr), and says that 'Alā'-ud dīn Suhrāb made no attempt to hold it, but surrendered it at once, and sought his own safety by swearing allegiance to the invader, and entering his service. It goes on to say that after this, Sultān Mahmūd Khilji marched on Broach, and summoned Marjān the governor to surrender it. Marjān refused, and Muḥmād was about to besiege the town when, by the advice of 'Alā'-ud-dīn Suhrāb, he decided, instead to attack the capital at once, and marched to Baroda, where he was joined by Gangādās of Chāmpāner and other chiefs. Crossing the Māhī river he advanced to Kapadvanj, where 'Alā'-ud dīn deserted him and joined his old master. Nothing of this appears in the *Tabaqāt* or in *Firishtah*. The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* has a long account of Kutb ud-dīn's going to a *faqīr* or saint to intercede for him. At last we come to the fact that 'Alā'-ud dīn returned to his old master, and was received with favour. He told Kutb ud dīn that Sultān Mahmūd was advancing by Kaparbanj, and advised him to proceed thither (p. 143).

Couplet

¹ I hear you play the ball without a *chaugan* in your house
If you wish to challenge come this is the ball and this the field

Sultān Qutb ud din ordered Sadr Jahan to write a reply to the couplet Sadr Jahan wrote in reply

Couplet

If a *chaugan* I take in my hand thy head like a ball shall I hurl
But I am ashamed to torment my prisoner in this way

In this couplet there is a hint to the fact that Sultān Hūshang who was the master and patron of Sultān Mahmud had been captured and had been kept as a prisoner by Sultān Muzaffar Shah who had however afterwards treated him with favour and had given back to him the kingdom of Malwa as the pen has conveyed this meaning in the account of the reign of Muzaffar Shah After this after some days on the night of the 3rd Safar Sultān Mahmud mounted with the intention of making a surprise night attack ² but being defeated went away to Malwa as has been described in detail in the section about Malwa On the way the Kohis and Bhils greatly harassed (Sultān Mahmud's army) Sultān Qutb ud din returned to Ahmadabad his capital crowned with victory and triumph

After a time the *na'irs* said that ⁴ Firuz Khan son of Shams Khan Dandani who was the ruler of Nagor had died His brother Mujahid Khan took possession of Nagor and Shams Khan his son for fear of his ⁵ uncle had fled and sought the protection of Rana Kumbha son

¹ There are some verbal differences in the couplet as given in the MSS and in the lith ed and in the lith ed of Firishtah I have adopted the version which appeared to me to be the best

Firishtah has در مسلح مصر towards the end of Safar and the Cambridge History of India page 301 says that the abortive night attack was made on the night of the 1st April 1451

² Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India page 301 give somewhat detailed account of the abortive night attack and the battle which took place on the following morning

⁴ Firuz Khan died in 860 A H 143 A D

⁵ Both MSS and the lith ed have برادر brother which is of course incorrect Firishtah has عم uncle برادر in the text edition

of Rānā Mūkul Rānā Kūmbhā determined that he would recover Nāgōi from the possession of Mujāhid Khān, and make it over to Shams Khān, but on the condition that the latter would demolish three of the turrets of the citadel of Nāgōi. His reason for this was that before this Rānā Mūkul had fled in great distress and disgrace from Firūz Khān, and in that battle three thousand Rājput̃s had been slain, and if now his son demolished three of the bastions of the fort, the people of the world would say that, although Rānā Mūkul had fled, yet he having acquired power over the fort had had his revenge. Shams Khān, who was helpless, accepted this condition in his great distress. After some days Rānā Kūmbhā having collected troops marched against Nāgōi and Mujāhid Khān being unable to meet him, went and begged for help from Sultān Mahmūd Khālji. Shams Khān then went and took possession of the fort of Nāgōi. Rānā Kūmbhā sent him a message, that he should now carry out his promise. Shams Khān summoned the *amīns* and the heads of the clans and brought up the matter for discussion. Some of them said that it was a matter of pity that Firūz Khān had not begotten a daughter, so that she might have saved the honour of the family. Shams Khān replied in a spirit of shame and self depreciation and anger and said that it was not possible that any part of the fort should be demolished, till many heads should have been cut off. Rānā Kūmbhā on hearing this news went back to his own country, and having collected a large army again advanced on Nāgōi. Shams Khān having repaired the ruined parts of the fort, left all his army and the heads of the clans in it, and himself went on wings of speed to Ahmadābād to seek for help. Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh conferred many favours on him, and married his daughter in the *nikāh* form. After the marriage festivities were finished, he sent ¹ Rāy Rām Chand Nāik, and Malīk Gadāī and some other *amīns* to re-inforce the men of Nāgōi, and kept Shams Khān in attendance on himself till the day, when it was reported to him, that Rānā Kūmbhā had fought with the men of Nāgōi, and had slain a large number of them, and had devastated wherever there was any cultivation and people outside the fort.

¹ رای امین چند نایک in the text-edition

On hearing this news the spirit of anger and daring of Sultān Qutb ud dīn was excited and he advanced against the fort of ¹ Kumbhalmir in the year 560 A H. When he arrived in the vicinity of the fort of Ābu Gita Deorah the Rājā of the fort came out and did homage and represented that Rana Kumbha had taken the fort from him by force and had left his own *thanadar* there. Sultān Qutb ud dīn appointed Malīk Shāh bīn Sultānī who had the title of Imad ul mulk in charge of the fort of Ābu and himself advanced towards his original destination. Malīk Imad ul mulk who was inexperienced immediately commenced a battle and had a large number of his men slain. When this news reached the Sultān he declared that he would at the time of his return capture the fort of Ābu and make it over to Gita Deorah. He sent a messenger to summon Imad ul mulk and himself advanced to seize the fort of Sirohi. When he arrived in its neighbourhood the Rājā engaged him in a battle and was defeated.

From that place the Sultān invaded the country of Rana Kumbha and sent troops in all directions so that they might ravage the country and destroy the temples. When he arrived at the fort of Kumbhalmir Rana Kumbha sallied out of the fort set the fire of warfare ablaze and having had a large number of his followers slain

¹ Called Kumbhalgarh in the Cambridge History of India page 30. Bayley page 149 calls it Kumbhalmir and says in a note quoting Tod's Rajasthan Chapter VIII that it was one of the 32 fortresses erected by Rana Kumbha. In Ras Mala (vol I p 32) it is called Komulmer and it is said to be the greatest of the 32 fortresses attributed to Koombho. Altogether there are 84 fortresses erected for the defence of Mewar. The correct name of Rana Koombho appears according to an inscription in a temple which stands at the village called Raipoor about five miles from the town of Sadee or Saduree in Mewar to have been Rana Shree Koombh Kurn or according to correct transliteration Rana Sr Kumbhakarna (note on page 353).

The Cambridge History of India makes no mention of the incident which took place at the fort of Ābu. Frishtah does but he says nothing about the Rājā rendering homage to the Sultan. The name of the Rājā of Ābu is given in the MSS as گیتا دھورہ and in the lithed as گیتا دھورہ. In the Mirat al-Sikanda (Bayley page 149) he is called Khatia Deorah Rājā of Sirohi. This can scarcely be correct as the Rājā of Sirohi appears to have fought with Qutb ud dīn and to have been defeated by him.

again retired into the fort. He, however, sent out parties every day, and fought battles and each time defeat fell on him. In the end, Kūmbhā came forward in distress and humility, and offered suitable tribute. The Sultān then returned to Ahmadābād.

¹ At the end of the year, Sultān Mahmūd Khālji sent ² Tāj Khān who was one of his great *amīns*, to the boundary of Gujrāt, to knock at the door of peace. The *amīns* and the chief men of Gujrāt induced Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn for the benefit of the people, to agree to the treaty.

³ Shaikh Nizām-ud-dīn and the prince of the learned men Sadī Jāhān came to Chāmpānī from the side of Sultān Mahmūd, and Qādī Hisām-ud-dīn and some others went from Ahmadābād. They drew up the treaty in this way, that the armies of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn should plunder and ravage such parts of the territories of Rānā Kūmbhā as were contiguous to Gujrāt and Sultān Mahmūd should seize ⁴ the country of Mēwār and Amhar and the neighbouring country. (It was also agreed that) whenever necessary they should not fail to give help and assistance to each other. Letters of peace

¹ According to the Cambridge History of India, page 302, Ghiyās-ud-dīn, son of Mahmūd Khālji, led a raid into his dominions as far as Sūrat, but retired hurriedly on hearing of Qutb-ud-dīn's return, and it was after this that Sultān Mahmūd Khālji sent the mission to propose a treaty of peace. The raid led by Ghiyās-ud-dīn is not mentioned in the text or in Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī or in Rās Mālā.

² Firishtah says Tāj Khān was the وزیر کل, minister in charge of all departments of Sultān Mahmūd Khālji. Neither the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the ambassador.

³ The names of the men sent to draft the treaty do not appear to be mentioned in any other history.

⁴ The lith. ed. of Firishtah has بلاد و فرابانی میوات و امهر, and Col. Briggs the districts of Mewar and Aheerwara. The other histories do not give the names of the districts which were to be ravaged respectively by the Gujrāt and Mālwa armies. The Cambridge History of India, page 302, says, that the western part of the Rānā's dominion were allotted to Gujarāt, and the eastern parts to Mālwa. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley, page 150) is less definite. According to it, Sultān Mahmūd Khālji would assail the Rānā from one side and Sultān Kutb-ud-dīn from the other. Rās Mālā (vol. I, p. 353) says that the treaty was to the effect that Rānā Koombho's dominion should be partitioned "between the two Mohummedan powers."

containing these terms were written and made over to the great men of the age

In the year 861 A.H. (1451 A.D.) Sultan Qutb ud din again marched to invade Kumbhālmir and on the way he took the fort of Ābu and according to his promise delivered it over to Gita Deorāh. From Ābū he advanced towards Kumbhālmir and Rana Kumbha left that place and retired to the fort of Chitor. On the way he saw an uneven and difficult place and halted there. After the two armies had met the fire of war blazed up but when night came they retired to their respective places. On the next day the battle began again and Sultan Qutb ud din himself fought like Rustam. Rana Kumbha then hid himself in the hills and sent emissaries and begged for pardon. He sent ¹ four maunds of gold and some elephants and other tribute and entered into an engagement that he would after that never again cause any injury to the country of Nagor. Sultan Qutb ud din returned with victory and triumph and went back to Ahmadābad.

But three months had not yet elapsed when news came that Rana Kumbha was again attempting with an army of fifty thousand horsemen to devastate Nagor. The same day that the news came ² the Sultan came out of Ahmadābad and halted for a month outside the city for the purpose of mustering his troops. Pina Kumbha hearing the news of the Sultan's preparations retired to his own station and took up his position there. Sultan Qutb ud din also on hearing the news returned and entered the city and spent his time in pleasure and enjoyment.

¹ Firsihtah makes it fourteen *ma*is of gold and two large elephant and other fine things. Col Briggs (vol IV p 4) says that 14 maunds of solid gold and two elephants which carried it were paid to Kootb Shah and a sea sonable donation was also made to Sooltan Mahmood Khilji but that was after the latter had advanced on Chitor.

Firsihtah is more explicit about the Sultan's promptitude in starting. He says that the messenger bearing the report came to Ahmadabad at night when the سلطان was in a state of sleep. He went to the *dar* where he went the same night to the Sultan but found him drunk and asleep. He could not wait but put the Sultan in a *mihaffal* (a litter) and took him one stage the next day and then they halted for one month for the *istimdad* or mustering of the troops.

In the beginning of the year 1862 A H , the Sultān made a strong resolution to punish the *zamīndārs* and marched to Sirōhī. The ² Rāja who was a relation of Rānā Kūmbhā fled to the hills, and took shelter there and for the third time Sirōhī was burnt down, and the other towns were raided and ravaged. Then (the Sultān) sent detachments to ravage the dominions of Rānā Kūmbhā, and himself advanced to the fort of Kūmbhalmūr. At this time intelligence came that Sultān Mahmūd Khālji had advanced towards the fort of Chitōr, by way of Mandsūr, and seized all the *parganas* near the last-named place. Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn now besieged the Rānā in the fort of Kūmbhalmūr with a firm determination, but as a considerable time elapsed, and he knew that it would be difficult to seize it, he gave up the siege, and advanced towards the fortress of Chitōr, and after plundering and ravaging the country around it, ³ went back to Ahmadābād. To everyone of the soldiers whose horses had become disabled during the campaigns, the Sultān gave the price of one from the treasury, and thought it proper, in this way, to show kindness to them. Rānā Kūmbhā sent ambassadors after the Sultān and in great humility and distress prayed to be excused for his offences, and the Sultān again drew the pen of forgiveness across his guilt, and sent back the ambassadors, pleased and happy.

And again in the year 863 A H , the Sultān wanted to march with his army, but he happened to fall ill. He then went one day to see Saiyid Muhammad, who was celebrated as Qutb-i-Ālam, who lived in peace and contentment in the town of Batūh, and resolved in his mind, how nice it were if the holy and high God should bestow on him a

¹ The year is *اثنین و سبعین و ثمانمائة* in both MSS, (one of which also gives it in figures, 872), and in the lith ed, but this is incorrect, the correct year being 862 A H or perhaps 861 A H. Firishtah has 861, Col Briggs 861 A H, 1457 A D, and the Cambridge History of India, 1456 as the year of the destruction of Sirōhī. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley) has 862 A H, 1456 as the year. It will be seen that later on the MSS and the lith ed give the correct year 863 A H.

² He is called Sains Mal in the Cambridge History of India, page 302. I cannot find his name anywhere else.

³ Firishtah says that Sultān Qutb ud dīn returned to his capital with *غنیمت بی پایان*, i.e., plunder that could not be conceived, but contrary to that Col Briggs (vol IV, p 42) says that the Rana gave fourteen maunds of solid gold and two elephants. See note 1, page 233.

worthy son His Holiness the Saīyid the beloved of God may God sanctify his tomb¹ knew what was in the Sultan's mind by his spiritual illumination and said Your younger brother who is like your son will keep the dynasty of Muzaffar Shah alive The Sultan rose in despondence and day by day his illness increased He died on the 123rd Rājab of the aforementioned year and was buried in the enclosure of Sultan Muhammad Shah's tomb In proclamations and *farmans* they styled him Sultan Ghazī The period of his reign was² seven years and six months and thirteen days He was a *badshah* noted for his bravery and high spirits but at the times when the fire of his wrath flamed up and specially when he was intoxicated with wine he did many evil deeds and was greedy and reckless in killing and shedding blood

When Sultan Qutb ud dīn died his *amirs* put Shams Khan son of Firuz Khan to death on the suspicion that his daughter who was a *mukah* wife of the Sultan had given him poison and the mother of the Sultan made her over to the slave girls who tore her to pieces and thus killed her with torment

³ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN DĀUD SHĀH SON OF AHMAD SHĀH SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH SON OF MUZAFFAR SHĀH

When the *amirs* and the pillars of the state and the great men of the kingdom had carried out the ceremonies of mourning for

¹ Col Briggs gives the 29th May 1459 as the date of his death whereas the Cambridge History of India page 303 has May 15th 1458 Neither the *Mirat-i-Sikandar* nor *Ras Mala* gives the date of his death or the period of his reign but the former has some curious stories about his wounding himself in the knee but (Bayley p 158) quoting the *Tarikh-i-Bahādar Shahi* says that Shams Khan's daughter gave him poison at the instigation of her father Firishtah's account of the way in which Shams Khan and his daughter were murdered is somewhat different as regards the particulars The Cambridge History of India page 303 says Qutb ud dīn's officers at Nagaur put Shams Khan to death which cannot be correct if it implies that he was put to death at Nagaur As regards his daughter it says that she was made over to her jealous co-wives Firishtah does say that she was made over to *برده* *ارو حوس دل برد* but the statements are hardly identical

Firishtah has seven years and seven months

³ There are slight differences in the heading I have translated it as it is in one MS The other MS omits the word *سلطان* and the 11th ed substitute *سلطان* for *سلطان*

¹ There is a difference in the readings. Both the MSS have ايماً يكي ار , but the lith ed has ار ايمە، له فراشي ، فراشايرا

³ One MS and the lith ed have *ساعة*, but the other MS *ساعات*. I have adopted the former

⁴ Malik 'Alā ul mulk in one MS and in the lith ed, but Malik 'Imād ul-mulk in the other MS. There is a good deal of confusion about this. Firishtah lith ed, says nothing about anybody being sent to the mother of Sultān Qutb ud dīn, but says that by the advice of 'Imād ul mulk, they raised Mahmūd Khān, the younger brother of Sultān Qutb ud-dīn, who was in his fourteenth year to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 303, says that the *amīns* raised his (which would mean Dāūd's, which is certainly incorrect) younger brother Abu 'l Fath Mahmūd on the throne. Bayley (p 160) says that the *amīns* deputed 'Ala ul Mulik bin Suhrāb to the mother of Fateh Khān. I have adopted 'Alā ul-mulk. عماد الملک has been adopted in the text edition.

mulk bin Suhrab to the palace of Maḥdum i Jahan the widow of Sultān Muhammad who was a ¹ daughter of one of the Sultāns of Hind so that he might bring Shahzada Fath Khan son of Muhammad Shah and all of them combined together to place him on the throne Maḥduma i Jahan said in reply Please keep your hands off my son for he has not the strength to bear this heavy burden It so happened however that Malik Ala ul mulk went privately to wait on Shahzada Fath Khan and made him mount a horse and took him to the royal palace The other *amirs* hastened to wait on him and carried out the ceremony of congratulating him and on that very day which was Sunday the first of Sha ban of that year placed him on the throne of empire and gave him the title of Sultān Mahmud The period of the reign of Daud Shah was ³ seven days

⁴ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN MAHMŪD SHĀH SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH

When Sultān Mahmud ascended the throne of Gujrat on Sunday the ⁵ first day of Sha ban 863 A H according to the advice and counsel

¹ According to the Mirat i Sikandar Bayley page 160 she was Bib Moghal who appears to have been a daughter of one of the Jams of Sind

One MS and the lith ed has سرور sons but the other MS has سرور son

³ The period of the reign of Daud Shah is not mentioned by Firhtah or by Col Briggs The Mirat i Sikandar Bayley (p 160) agree with Nizam ud din and has seven days Rasmala say indefinitely only a few days but the Cambridge History of India page 303 give him a reign of no more than 7 days This is incorrect and is contradicted by the fact that the date of the death of Qutb ud din said in the same page to have been May 18th 1458 and that of the accession of Sultan Mahmud also on the same page May 9th Unlike others Daud Shah does not appear to have come at once to a violent end The Mirat i Sikandar Bayley (p 160) says Sultan Daud got out of a window facing the river Sabar and went into hiding He reigned only seven days It is related that he entered as an inquirer into the monastery of Sheikh Adhan Rum and became one of his attendants in a short time he obtained advancement (in spiritual rank) He soon afterwards died

⁴ That is the heading in both MSS The lith ed has ذکر الہ - فتح خان المعظم محمود ساء بن محمد ساء بن احمد ساء

⁵ Neither Firhtah nor Col Briggs gives the date of the accession The Mirat i Sikandar give the same day and date as in the text and the corresponding A D date a 18th June 1459 Rasmala does not give the date

of the *amīrs*, and sat in the place of his father, he made the various sections of the people happy by his universal benefactions in accordance with their respective ranks. They say, that on that day, in addition to Arab, 'Iraḡī and Turkī horses, and valuable robes of honour, and jewelled-belts and swords, and daggers embossed with gold, a *ḡarḡ* of *ṭankas* was given away.

When six months had passed, ¹Malik Kabīr Sultānī, who had the title of 'Add-ul-mulk, Maulānā Khidrī, who had that of Safī-ul-mulk, Pīārāh Ismā'il, who bore that of Burhān-ul-mulk, and Jhajū Muhammad, who had that of Hīsām-ul-mulk, from the wickedness of their natures and the refractoriness of their dispositions, prepared to create turmoil and disturbance. They resolved amongst themselves, that they would cause Malik Sha'bān ² 'Imād-ul-mulk, in whose grasp of power the reins of the *vazārat* were, to be removed (from his office), so that this wicked intention and dishonest determination of theirs might gain currency and success. In order to carry out this resolution, they represented (to the Sultān) in private, that 'Imād-ul-mulk wanted to place ³ his own son, Shahāb-ud-dīn, on the throne, and like Malik Mughīth Khālji has determined that the rule of the empire should be

The Cambridge History of India, page 303, does not give the A H date but gives an A D date different from that given by Bayley, viz, May 25th 1458

¹ The names and titles of the conspirators are the same in the MSS and the lith ed, except that the last name which is جہاؤ محمد Jhajū Muhammad in the MSS appears to be منجہو محمد Manjhū Muhammad in the lith ed

Firishtah mentions the first three of the conspirators by their titles alone. Col Briggs gives the titles of all four. The Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 163, gives slightly different names and titles, viz, Kabīr-ud-dīn Sultānī entitled Burhān-ul Mulk, Maulāna Khizr entitled Safī-ul-Mulk, Hāmid bin Isma'il entitled 'Azd ul Mulk, and Khwājah Muhammad entitled Hīsām-ul Mulk.

² This علا الملك appears to be the same person who is designated علا الملك earlier on. See note 4 on p 236

³ Firishtah and Col Briggs and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī (Bayley) all agree that the conspirators accused 'Imād ul mulk with the intention of raising his own son Shahāb ud dīn, on the throne, and Nizām ud dīn's reference to Malik Mughīth Khālji confirms this, but the Cambridge History of India, page 303, says quite incorrectly, that the conspirators accused 'Imād ul-mulk of the determination of placing Sultān Mahmūd's own son, whom it gives the name of Shihāb ud dīn, and describes as an infant, on the throne, so that he might be able to govern the country as regent

transferred to his own family. Mahmud Shah told them that he had also inferred the same thing from Imad ul mulk's behaviour. He gave orders for the latter being arrested and placed in confinement. He was kept under guard on the upper floor of the gate of Ahmadabad. The Sultan placed five hundred of the men whom he trusted to guard him. Add ul mulk and the other conspirators (thinking that they were quite) successful went to their own houses.

It so happened however that Malik Abd ul lah the superintendent of the elephants who was one of the men in whom the Sultan reposed confidence asked for a private audience and having reported the deceit and treachery of that deceitful crew stated that they had taken ¹ Shahzada Hasan Khan to the house of one of themselves and having made asseverations and taking oaths had made the imprisonment of Imad ul mulk a means for attaining their own objects. Sultan Mahmud made enquiries and having impressed the true state of things on his mind and keeping some of his old and faithful adherents such as

Haji and Malik Baha ud din and Malik Kalu and Malik Ain ud din with him said to Malik Abd ul lah that he should get all the elephants ready and bring them to the *darbar* so that he might throw Imad ul mulk under the feet of an elephant. He also ordered Malik Sharf ul mulk that he should bring the wicked and ungrateful Sha bin to the *darbar* so that the superintendent of the elephants may throw him under the feet of an elephant. When Malik Sharf ul mulk went to bring Imad ul mulk the guards said that they could not hand him over without the permission of Malik Add ul mulk. He came back and reported what the guards had said to the Sultan. Sultan Mahmud then ascended to the top of the bastion and said in

¹ Firishlah also says that the conspirators wanted to raise prince Hasan Khan on the throne but Col Briggs (vol IV p 46) has changed the name to Hoossein. The Mirat-i-Sikandar (Bayley p 164) however say that the conspirator wanted to raise Hab b Khan on the *masnad* and Bayley say in a note that according to Firishlah and the Farikh-i-Alfi the accession of Hab b Khan was the real object of the plot. The statement as far as Firishlah is concerned appears to me to be incorrect. The Cambridge History of India page 303 agrees with Nizam ud din and Firishlah that it was Hasan Khan whom the conspirator wanted to place on the throne.

² The name Haj without any prefix or suffix in the MSS as well as in the lith ed but Firishlah and the Mirat-i-Sikandar both call him Mahi Haj;

a loud voice "Bring Sha'bān quickly, and throw him under the feet of an elephant. When the men heard these words from the Sultān himself, a large number of people went and brought him. When the Sultān's eye fell on him, he ordered "bring that wicked man here, so that I may ask him some questions. When they brought him up, (the Sultān was evidently standing on a platform), he ordered that the chain should be removed from the hands and neck of this faithful servant, so that he might inquire into the conduct of, and punish the wicked wretches. Some of the connected *amīns* (i.e., apparently those who were connected with the conspirators), who were occupied with the duty of guarding him, on seeing this threw themselves down from the top (of the bastion, or some platform some way up), and some of them raised a cry of mercy.

When this news reached 'Add-ul-mulk and the other conspirators, they were amazed at the result of their action, and commenced to collect their retainers. At the approach of the true dawn, Sultān Mahmūd came to the window of the *darbār-hall*, and saluted the people. He placed the fly-whisk in the hand of 'Imād-ul-mulk, so that he might drive away the flies. Malik 'Abd-ul-Jah, the superintendent, had all the elephants there. About three hundred (thirty hundred ?), men including both free men and slaves attended to perform the *kūnīsh* (royal salute).² At this time, the rebel *amīns* came towards

¹ The Sultān who was up to this time calling 'Imād-ul-mulk a *harām Ḥuār* (lit. one who eats forbidden foods, a wicked wretch) now calls him according to the MSS *halāl Ḥuār* (lit. one who eats unforbidden food, an honest man). The behaviour of the Sultān is somewhat enigmatical. If as Firishtah says he had understood the deceit of the conspirators from the beginning, he acted with a good deal of dissimulation and astuteness for a lad of fifteen, and there is no other explanation. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 47) says, "He had sufficient discretion to see the matter in its true light and at the same time too much prudence openly to avow his sentiments." Rās Mālā (vol I, p. 355) says, that though only fourteen years of age he evinced a determination to protect a faithful minister against his enemies. On the other hand, the Cambridge History of India, page 303, says that new to political intrigues, he believed the conspirators, but later on after consulting his mother and a few of his immediate attendants he determined on a course of action.

² Somewhat contrary to this, Firishtah on the authority of Hājī Muhammad Qandahārī, says that the rebels came with thirty thousand horse and foot ready for battle, and that at that time there were not more than سی صد thirty

the *darbar hall* attended by the riff raff of the city and their own retainers. When they came near Imad ul mulk and Malik Hajji and the other *sardars* with the immediate servants (of the Sultan) placed the elephants before them and made an attack on the rebels and Add ul mulk and the other traitors fled. Their soldiers threw away their arms in the lanes of the city and hid themselves. Out of the rebel *amirs* Hissam ud din went to his brother Rukn ud din who was the *kotwal* of Pattan and from that place they both went away to Malwa. Add ul mulk with a single retainer went among the *grassias* and as his retainers had slain some of the *grassias* of that neighbourhood they recognised him and slew him and they sent his head ¹ filled with turbulence to Ahmadabad. As Burhan ul mulk was a man of big size he could not run away and concealed himself

hundred or three thousand men including free men and slave with the Sultan and they all washed their hands of their lives and became thoroughly frightened. Some said let us go into such and such a mansion and shut the doors and defend ourselves. Others said let us collect as much of the jewels and treasure as we can and make our escape. The Sultan did not approve of either of the counsels but armed himself and bound his quiver round his waist and with the thirty (three) hundred followers and the elephants which did not exceed two hundred in number came out of the palace to meet the rebels. He posted the elephants at the heads of the various approaches so that the enemy might not attack from different sides and advanced with the greatest calmness and composure. The people on seeing this immediately deserted the rebels and some joined the Sultan and others hid themselves. Col Briggs's account (vol IV p 48) agrees with the above but he makes the number of the rebels thirty thousand and that of the Sultan's followers 300 although in the Persian text the one is سی هزار سوار و پیاده and the other سی صد سوار. It must be said however that the number of the Sultan's followers is also given in the Tabagat as سیصد.

Bayley (p 165) also says that the Sultan's followers amounted only to three hundred in number and some of them suggested that they should get out of the palace by the windows on the side of the Sabar(mati) and collect men and then return but the Sultan did not listen to these cowards.

¹ There is some difference in the readings. The MSS have سر بر سر head filled with turbulence and سر بر سر head placed on an arrow and the lithed has سر بر سر which is not intelligible. None of the readings is quite satisfactory but I have adopted the first. Firishtah has سر او را بریده, having cut off his head.

near the town of Saikhēj, in the uneven ground near the Sābarmatī. It so happened that one of the eunuchs went to circumambulate the tomb of Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified¹ He saw Burhān-ul-mulk seated there, and immediately seized him, and brought him to the *darbāi*, where by order of the Sultān he was² executed Maulānā Khidī, Safī-ul-mulk,³ was seized and sent to Dīp in imprisonment As this disturbance was suppressed in this way, and friend was discriminated from foe⁴ 'Imād-ul-mulk threw the skit of his spirit over the grandeur of the *vazārat*, and like men freed (of the cares of the world) he held his hand from all worldly affairs, and took kindly to the nook of contentment and⁵ seclusion, and relinquishing his *jāgīr* became a beadsman⁶ Sultān Mahmūd began to show favour to his soldiers, granted⁶ favours to fifty-two of his own servants, so that in the course of a short time, the number of his soldiers became double that of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn and of the former Sultāns He conferred titles on all his own slaves, Malīk Hājī was honoured with the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk, and the office of the paymaster of the forces Malīk Bahā-ud-dīn was made Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Malīk Tughān Farhat-ul-mulk, Malīk 'Am-ud-dīn Nizām-ul-mulk, and Malīk Sa'ad Bakht Burhān-ul-mulk

¹ Firishtah says *بربر نای قبل مست انداخته با حاک یکسان ساختند*, i e, he was trodden to death under the feet of a *mast* elephant

² Firishtah says he was not executed as *چون چندان گناه ندانست*, i e, as he was not so guilty as the others

³ According to Firishtah the Sultān did not forget 'Imād ul mulk's services He says *و سلطان محمود بدست حقوق حدمات شایسته او ماهر داشتہ اورا معدور داشت و بر بزرگ او سہاب الدین احمد را بہاب ملک السرف دادہ ار امرای کلان گردانند*

⁴ The lith ed has *کدح*, before *عرا*, but as both the MSS omit it, I have also omitted it

⁵ Some of these matters are mentioned with some variation in the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* (Bayley, p 166)

⁶ It is not clear who these fifty-two servants or slaves were, and why the favours shown to them led to the increase in the number of troops As to the increase the actual words are *دہ بست*, in the MSS and *دہ بیست* in the lith ed I have adopted the readings of the MSS, and think that it means in the proportion of twenty to ten, i e, double Some of these events are mentioned in the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* (Bayley, p 167)

¹ In the year 864 A H he marched in the direction of Kaparbanj and having gone hunting as far as the boundary of Malwa returned. In the course of this expedition he regulated the administration of the *thanas* and of the *parganas* and attended with care to the condition of the oppressed. In the year 866 A H he started from the capital city of Ahmadabad with the object of seeing the country and hunting and encamped on the bank of the river Kharī which is fifteen *karoḥs* from Ahmadabad. At this time he received a letter from ² Nizam Shah son of Humayun Shah the ruler of the Deccan in which after complaining (of the injuries he had received) at the hand of Sultan Mahmud Khalji he asked for assistance and reinforcement. ³ Mahmud Shah with a very large army and five hundred elephants advanced to help Nizam Shah. When he arrived at Nadarbar and Sultanpur another letter came (to the effect) that Sultan Mahmud Khalji in his pride of his large army had advanced against this *fāqir* (i.e. he himself) by rapid marches and after the two armies had met in the first instance he was defeated and the soldiers of the writer plundered his camp and seized fifty elephants. But Sultan Mahmud came out of ambush with twelve thousand horsemen when his (i.e. Nizam Shah's) men were engaged in plundering. Sikandar Khan Bukhari and Khwajah Jahan Turk (who were commanders of Nizam Shah's army) exerted themselves as much as they could (but) Sultan Mahmud

¹ This excursion is not mentioned by Firishtah or any other historian except the author of the *Murat-i-Sikandari* (Bayley p. 170).

² The year is 866 in the MSS. but 860 in the lith. ed. *Firih-tah al-oḥa* 866 and Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 49) 866 A H 1460 A D. Bayley (p. 170) also gives the same year and he calls the river Kharī and says on the authority of the *Tabakat-i-Akbari* it is eleven *ḥos* from Ahmadabad.

³ He was a mere child at this time and the government was carried on by his mother and the prime minister and there was a certain amount of jealousy and intrigue (see pp. 87-88 in the history of his reign).

⁴ Firih-tah says that the *amirs* and the chief men of the city attempted to dissuade Mahmud Shah from going away on a distant expedition so soon after his accession specially as Daud Khan was attempting to recover the throne which he had occupied for a week but he did not agree with them and advanced arguments based on philosophical and humanitarian grounds in support of his determination. This is referred to by Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 49) but it does not appear to be mentioned in the *Murat-i-Sikandari* or in the Cambridge History of India.

himself advancing within bowshot, shot an arrow, which hit the forehead of Sikandar Khān's elephant. The animal turned round, and caused much havoc to the Deccan army and Sikandar Khān and Khwājah Jahān Tūrk seized the bridle of the *faqīr*'s horse, and started for Bīdar. The *faqīr* is at present at Fīrūzābād and Sultān Mahmūd is besieging the city of Bīdar. As His Majesty has advanced in this direction, with the object of helping the *faqīr*, it is hoped that he would come with all rapidity.

Mahmūd Shāh directed his attention to the Deccan. He heard on the way that Sultān Mahmūd Khālji had turned back and was going towards Mālwa. Mahmūd Shāh advanced into the country of Asī and Buhānpūr that he might close the path¹ of his flight, and encamped in the neighbourhood of Tālnūr, which is in the country of Asī. Sultān Mahmūd Khālji leaving the well-known road travelled by way of² Gōndwāna and owing to the difficulty of the road, and want of water, his men suffered great hardship. They say that more than thousand men perished for want of³ water. Mahmūd Shāh wrote and sent a letter to the effect, that "Whenever that⁴ pupil of the

¹ One MS inserts *برو* between *گزر* and *مسدود*. I think this is correct and have inserted it, though it is not found in the other MS and in the lith. ed.

² The Cambridge History of India (p. 304) instead of saying that Sultān Mahmūd Khālji travelled through Gōndwānā like the other histories, says that he was compelled to retire through the Mahādeo hills into Northern Berar where his army suffered severely both from want of water and from the attacks of the Korkūs. I have nowhere else come across the name of the Mahādeo hills or of the Korkūs. In the Persian text of Muntākhhab al-labāb, edited by Sir W. Haig, the editor of the Cambridge History of India, the retreat of Sultān Mahmūd Khālji (vol. III, p. 98), is said to have been through Gōndwāna and it is said that there was no sign of water along the route anywhere, and the troops are said to have suffered from thirst and at the hands of robbers roaming over the hills. In the Index of the Cambridge History of India the Mahādeo hills are mentioned only once in this particular place, and the Korkūs are mentioned only thrice. From one of these references (p. 358), it would appear that the "Korkūs" is only another name for the Gōnds.

³ One MS adds *و تنگی راه*, and the narrowing or difficulty of the road.

⁴ Both MSS have *فرید ساهنت*, but the lith. ed. has *فرد العين ساهنت*. I have retained the latter, as it is the common form of the word which means lit. the pupil of the eye, but is applied figuratively to some one who is very dear, such as one's son or daughter.

eye of empire shall have need for help and assistance he should notify the fact to the writer and there will be no neglect in according such help. He then returned to Ahmadabad.

¹ It is recorded by tradition that in this army there were twenty thousand well armed and picked horsemen with Mahmud Shah and that he had given away the whole of the country of Gujrat in *jagir* (fiefs) to the soldiers and there was not a single village as *khalsa* or royal land and that in the course of four years he had disbursed a * tenth part of the treasures left behind by his ancestors.

In the year 867 A.H. another letter from Nizam Shah arrived to the effect that Sultan Mahmud Khalji had invaded the Deccan with ninety thousand horsemen and as the promise of help and assistance had been inscribed with the tongue of the pen the writer hoped that he would direct his great spirit to the fulfilment of that promise. Mahmud Shah with a well equipped army marched towards the Deccan. When he arrived at Sultanpur and Nadarbur Sultan Mahmud Khalji having raided and ravaged the neighbourhood of Daulatabad had gone back to his own country. ² An epistle containing his excuses (2 thanks) came from Nizam Shah with presents and offerings to the Sultan and he turned back and went to Ahmadabad. He wrote to Sultan Mahmud Khalji that it appeared to be contrary to the law of Islam and against humanity to invade without any reason a country inhabited by Muslims and to return without fighting after such an invasion is reprehensible. If after this he again attempts to injure and harass the inhabitants of the country of Deccan he should know for a certainty that the writer would invade the country of Malwa. Sultan Mahmud replied that as he (the Sultan of Gujrat) had directed his noble spirit to the aid of the Deccan no injury would after this happen ³ from him to the inhabitants of that country.

¹ The facts with some variations are also mentioned in the *Mirat-i-Sikandari* (Bayley pp 176-177).

دو حصہ in the text edition.

² This is also mentioned by Firishtah and the *Mirat-i-Sikandari* (Bayley p 17) and the *Cambridge History of India* (p 300).

³ There is a little variation in the readings. The MSS have اربعاعاب while the lith. ed. has ارامس. There is not much difference and I have retained the reading in the lith. ed.

In the year 869 A H (1465 A D) it was reported to the Sultān that the *zamīndāns* of ¹ Bāwar and of the fort of Dūn had for two years been causing damage to the ships, and as they had never received any punishment from the Sultāns of Gujrāt, they had got into a habit of refractoriness and revolt. Although his loyal advisers did not consider it advisable that he should march to attack them owing to the difficulty of the route and the strength of the fortress, he determined to conquer that tract, and punish the rebellious chiefs. When after enduring a thousand hardships and difficulties, he advanced to the vicinity of the fort, the commandant came out to give battle and made gallant efforts. (But) when night came, he again took shelter in the fort and for some days, he fought battles every day, and fulfilled the duty of making war-like and gallant exertions. It happened, however, that one day the Sultān went to the top of the hill of Bāwar with his retinue and soldiers. When the men of the fort ² saw the royal umbrella, and became aware of the large number of soldiers, they with humility put their hands ³ on the skirt of peace, and ⁴ the

¹ The MSS have *امیں داراں ناور و بندردون* and *رمیں دار ناور و بندردون*, and the lith ed has *رمیددار و ناور و بندردون*. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. Firishtah lith ed has *قلعہ ماورا و بندردون*. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 51) calls Bāwar, Bavur "an extraordinary hill fort". The *Mirāt i Sikandarī* (Bayley p 178) has the mountain of Bāwar, and Bayley says in a note that the best accounts of the expedition are to be found in the *Tabakāt i Akbarī*, *Firishtah* and the *Tārīkh-i-Alfi*, and he quotes from the first two, which both have Bāwar. As to Dūn he says there is a small port marked Dunnu near to a spot where a spur of the ghats runs into the sea. He gives the various variants of Bāwar in the different MSS and the MS of the *Tārīkh i Alfi*, and they all have some resemblance to Bāwar, yet the Cambridge History of India, without a single word of explanation or a single reference to any authority, transforms the *zamīndāns* of Bāwar and of the port of Dūn to "the Hindu chief of Paidī near Damān" (see page 305). The conjunction *و* between *ناور* and *قلعہ دون* has unfortunately been changed into *د* in the text edition, and as a result *ناورد* reads *ناورد*.

² It would appear that the men in the fort were not up to that time aware of the presence of the Sultān in the camp.

³ Both the MSS have *صلح*, but the lith ed has *ندامیں صلح*. I have retained the last reading, as it has the correct oriental metaphor.

⁴ Both MSS have only *سردار*, but the lith ed has *دو سردار*. Here I have adopted the reading in the MSS.

commandant came in all haste to wait on the Sultān and prayed for quarter. Sultān Mahmud on account of his great mercy drew the pen of forgiveness over their guilt and gave assurances of safety to all of them. When the commandant of the fort and the chiefs of the neighbouring country came and waited on the Sultān he distinguished them all by bestowing robes of honour and favours on them. He then mounted his horse and went to inspect the fort. After he had finished the inspection the commandant presented a large tribute. The Sultān bestowed the amount of the tribute on him in the same *maylis* and also conferred on him a special robe of honour and a golden belt. He also fixed the amount of the annual tribute and entrusted the defence and government of the country to the commandant. He then returned with success and prosperity and took up his abode in Ahmadabad.

In the year 870 A.H. 1466 A.D. the Sultān went out hunting towards Ahmadnagar. On the way Bāha ul mulk son of Alī Khān killed Ādam Silahdar (trooper) without any apparent cause and fled into the country of Idār.¹ Sultān Mahmud sent Malik Hajī and Malik Kalu Add ul mulk and these men having gone a part of the way allowed a falsehood to enter their minds and they induced two

¹ The readings are different here. One MS has *عماد الملك و عصف الملك* با جماعت یعنی نمود آنها دو کس از نوکران بهاء الملك که کابل سلاحدار ما بودند را آوردند و آنها فرار دادند که بگویند ملک. The reading in the lith ed is *حاجی و ملک کالو عصف الملك را فرستاد و آنها خو باره راه رفتند بروبری* بخاطر رسانیده دو کس از نوکران را برین آوردند که قاتل ادم سلاحدار ما بودم. I have after comparing the three readings and that in the lith ed of Firishtah which contains more detail adopted the reading which appeared to me to be the best. In the text edition *عصف الملك* instead of *عصف الملك* ملک کالو عصف الملك.

According to Firishtah they induced the two men by giving them some money *مال فریبند*. They also told them that the badshah was merciful and would pardon them and besides he would not pass a sentence of death without consulting them. The poor men tempted by the money and also actuated by good feeling towards the master said as they had been taught. The Mirat-i-Sikandarī (Bayley p. 179) has a similar account but it says that the men sent in pursuit of Bāha ul mulk actually found him but apparently let him go.

of the servants of Bahā'-ul-mulk, to say that they were the murderers of Ādam Silāhdāi, and returning from the way, they reported to the Sultān, that they had seized and brought the murderers of Ādam Silāhdāi, and they were confessing their guilt and Bahā'-ul-mulk had fled into the country of Īdar. Sultān Mahmūd ordered that those two innocent men should be executed. After some days when the veil was raised from the face of the matter, and it was known for certain, that those two poor men were not the murderers of the Silāhdāi, and 'Imād-ul-mulk had by fraud and deceit induced them to confess, the Sultān ordered that 'Imād-ul-mulk and 'Add-ul-mulk should also be executed, and all the property and villages left behind by them should be escheated to the *Ihālsa* (the Sultān's treasury). Malik Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk was made 'Imād-ul-mulk and the appointment of *nā'ib ghāibat* (regent in the Sultān's absence) was conferred on him and all the soldiers of 'Imād-ul-mulk were made over to him.

² The Sultān marched out in the year 871 A H (1467 A D) to conquer the fort of Karnāl which is now known as Jūnāgarh. They

Bayley says in a note that every copy of the *Mirāt-i Sikandārī* says that the men sent in pursuit of Bahā' ul-mulk actually found him, but he also quotes the *Tabakāt-i Akbarī* to say that they returned after going a part of the way towards Īdar. According to the *Mirāt-i Sikandārī* the two men were induced to confess, as they were told that the Sultān would sentence them to short terms of imprisonments, and they would be soon released at the intercession of those who asked them to confess. Rās Mālā and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the incident. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 51) refers to the incident "As an instance of the impartial justice of Mahmood Shah". It was impartial as even great *amīrs* were not spared, but it is also an instance of a great miscarriage of justice. In the text edition the reading adopted is *دو ستمی بیگناہ*

¹ This sentence, which occurs in both MSS and in the lith. ed., appears to be redundant, unless it is taken as part of the false report.

² Firishtah says that in 871 A H the Sultān saw the Prophet Muhammad in a dream, and that the latter bestowed on him two dishes of delicious viands. This was interpreted to mean that he would have two great gifts, viz., the conquest of the country of Diu and the forthcoming conquest of Karnāl. There is no mention of it in the *Tabaqāt* and I cannot find any mention in the *Mirāt-i Sikandārī* also. Rās Mālā (vol I, p. 355) has a slightly different version, and refers only to an invitation "to the conquest of infidels, by spreading before him, in a vision, a magnificent banquet of the most delicious viands."

say that for nearly two thousand years this country had been in the possession of the ancestors of Ray.¹ Mandalik. After Sultān Muḥammad Tughlaq Shah and Sultān Ahmad Shah Gujrātī the hand of the possession of no one else had reached this country. Sultān Muḥammad Shah advanced towards it placing his trust in divine help and support and in the course of the march he ravaged the country of Sorath. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the hill of Karnal the inhabitants of the district placed their property and their families in distant places and in hills filled with trees and themselves took shelter in a strong place. Tughlaq Khan who was descended from the Sultāns of Sind and was the maternal uncle of the Sultān informed the latter of this. On the following day the Sultān proceeded in that direction as if hunting along the way. In spite of the

¹ Col Briggs (vol IV p 33) says in a note that the Manduliks as he writes the name are like *desaies natgows reddywars zemindars and poligars* so called in other parts of India. *Mandalika* is from *Mandala* a circle or a part of a country and means the lord of the *Mandala*. In the same note Col Briggs on the authority of the Moontukhibool Towareekh says that the name of this Mandalik was Humbur Ray. I cannot find his name anywhere else but the Cambridge History of India page 305 calls him Mandalak Chudasama but does not quote any authority and Mandalak is certainly incorrect. It appears from a note in Bayley page 183 that according to the Tarikh-i Sorath Mandalik was also used as a proper name by the Raos of Ginnar (Karnal).

The meaning is not very clear but it appears from the Mirat-i Sikandarī (Bayley page 184) that the Karnal people or the infidels of the country round gathered together their women and children and provision and went into the defile of Mahabalah which is an exceedingly strong position (mahabala means very strong). The Sultan resolved to carry the place. Prince Toghlak (the Tughlaq Khan of the text) told the Sultan that it would be very difficult to seize the place. But the Sultan replied: *Plea e God I will conquer it.* One day the Sultan mounted his horse to go hunting and went in the direction of the Mahabala defile. When the Hindu saw the small party they took no heed to it. Suddenly the Sultan attacked them and the infidel after a little fighting fled into the jungle (p 185). Firhat gives a somewhat different account. According to him the Sultan guided by Shahzada Tughlaq Khan went with a selected body of warriors to the *darra* or defile of Mahabala without the Hindu knowing anything. The Rajputs who were left to guard the place and who were called Baraos on becoming aware of the Sultan's approach fought bravely but being unprepared and unarmed were all killed. Ras-ul (vol I p 356) gives another version according to which the Sultan sent

difficulties of the paths and the entrances (probably passes), he succeeded in reaching that place, and after much effort and endeavour, the Rājput̃s fled, and threw themselves into the fort of Kaināl, by way of the hills and jungles. ¹ Many prisoners and much property fell into the hands of the army. From that place the Sultān went towards the temple of the people. A body of Rājput̃s who are called *Pradhāns* (*Pradhānas* or chiefmen), determining to die, placed their hands on their swords and lances inside the temple, and in the twinkling of an eye became food for the sword. The next day (the Sultān) started from that place, and encamped at the foot of the fort of Kaināl, and sent detachments to plunder and ravage the surrounding country. The Rāj Mandalik, in great humility and helplessness, asked for pardon of his offences, and sent a large tribute. ² Sultān Mahmūd, on account of the exigencies of the times, deferred the conquest of the fort to the next year, and treating the Mandalik with gentleness went back to Ahmadābād.

In the year 872 A H (1468 A D), it was reported to the Sultān that the Rāj Mandalik on account of his haughtiness and pride had an umbrella held over his head, and placing valuable ornaments, on his ³ arms and neck sat in public. Immediately on hearing this news (the Sultān) appointed forty thousand horsemen with famous elephants to punish him. At the time of bidding adieu to them,

a detachment under Toghluk Khān "to occupy two outworks called Mohabilla. The Rajpoots who were entrusted with the post were surprised and cut off." The Cambridge History of India makes no reference to the matter.

¹ According to Firishtah they comprised the *درهٔ مهاله* و *پسران و زنان*, the women and children of the men who had been left to defend the Mahābala defile.

² Firishtah says that the Sultān agreed to receive tribute and to defer the conquest for another year, because immense quantities of valuable jewellery and other booty had fallen into the hands of the soldiers, and the weather having become very hot, it was impossible to continue longer in that hilly country.

³ The MSS have *دست* and *گرفت* (unintelligible) و *کرد* in one, and *گردد* و *دست* in the other. The lith ed has simply *برحد*. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *دست و گرفت*, leaving out the middle word. Firishtah says plainly, that the Sultān was simply waiting for a pretext, and this report enabled him to undertake another expedition.

he told the *amirs* and the heads of clans that if the Mandalik came forward in the way of submission and fealty and delivered up the umbrella and the valuable jewel which on the days of idol worship he puts on his person and pay the tribute which had already been fixed they should not interfere in any way with his country. When the army of Gujarat arrived near the country of the Mandalik the commandant sent a body of men to him and communicated to him (through them) what the Sultan had said. The Rax Mandalik came forward to meet the emissaries with all respect and sent to the *amirs* the umbrella and the jewels and valuable ornaments which on the days of worshipping the idols and on other auspicious days he used to put on his person together with a large tribute and having tried to win their heart turned them back. When the *amirs* (after their return) waited on the Sultan and placed before him all the things which they had brought the latter in his festive assembly and convivial meeting gave the things away to story tellers and readers.

In the year 873 A.H. 1469 A.D. the news of the death of Sultan Mahmud Khalji the ruler of Malwa came. The *amirs* represented

¹ Firihlah qu'ing Sir mul lin says th k m thuk in dntal v rd but because such prodigality appears to him as it certainly appears to me to be somewhat more than a little with the pen ejaculations واللہ اعلم بالصواب and Codalalonekn with truth Col Briggs (vol IV p 75) say in his translation the Sultan is troubled that he may produce the the expedition in one night among a set of male lancers. It may be right but گوندگان و حواندگان means story tellers and readers and not male lancers. The Minut Sahandari (Bayley p 186) modifies the story a little and says the Sultan is troubled that he may produce the expedition among his musicians. Bayley is not finally so much kind of fault with Firihlah and says the latter places the expedition in 874 A.H. It appears to me that Firihlah does nothing of the kind he places the expedition before the occurrence of 873 A.H. Col Briggs (vol IV p 75) however places this expedition in 874 A.H. which might have led to Bayley's mistake.

² This matter about the death of Sultan Mahmud Khalji does not appear to be mentioned by Firihlah. The Cambridge History of India p 30 mentions it giving the 31st May 1469 as the date of Sultan Mahmud Khalji's death. It also refers to the discussion about the invasion of the country and Sultan Mahmud's refusal to undertake it and then says that the Sultan committed an act as a vantage by leading into Sindh a large army against the Mandalak of Curnar.

to Sultān Mahmūd that at the time, when Sultān Muhammad, the son of Ahmad Shāh had accepted the summons of the just God, Sultān Mahmūd Khalji arrived at the town of ¹ Kapaibanj, intending to attempt the conquest of the country of Gujāt. If the Lord of the world (meaning the Sultān) at this time, when the appliances for the conquest of the country are all at hand and ready, advances towards Mālwa, that country would come into his possession with very little effort. Sultān Mahmūd declared, that it was not right in Islām and Musalmānī, that Musalmāns should fall out amongst themselves, and that people should be trampled down in the calamities which would occur. Besides, at this time, when the Sultān has died, and the affairs of the state have not been arranged, it would be removed from the rules of humanity and the customs of generosity to invade his country. He then left Ahmadābād with the object of hunting, and having spent some days in the jungle, again took up his abode in Ahmadābād.

In the year 874 A H, he again sent armies to plunder and ransack the country of Sōrath, and within a short time, they returned after devastating the country, and bringing an enormous quantity of plunder. Among the great incidents of the year, one was this that Sultān Mahmūd, mounted on an elephant, went towards ² *Bāgh-i-Iram*. On the way ³ another *mast* elephant, having broken his chain turned on the Sultān's ⁴ retinue. The other elephants seeing it, turned their faces in flight, and it advanced on the elephant which the Sultān was riding. The latter after bearing two or three onsets, also fled; and when it was running away, the other elephants rushing forward, struck it (apparently with their tusks) on the shoulder, and the Sultān's leg was injured by its tusks and blood began to flow from it. At this

¹ کیریج Kēryanj in the text-edition

² Apparently some beautiful park or garden, called the garden of Paradise. Firishtah's account agrees with that in the text, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 55) gives a somewhat different account. He says that the Sultan was on a hunting excursion and when he was attacked by the *mast* elephant, all his companions fled, etc.

³ This word shows that the Sultān was also riding a *mast* elephant, and Firishtah says so, but neither the MSS nor the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* say that the Sultān was on a *mast* elephant.

⁴ The word is *fauj*, apparently the Sultān's retinue or followers.

time the Sultān with great bravery hurled a spear on the elephant's forehead. The blood was now flowing, but the elephant made another onset and had another spear hurled at it. The blood now bubbled out of its forehead as from a fountain. The animal now trumpeted and gave another blow to the Sultān's elephant, but it received another spear with such force that it had to turn tail and run away. The Sultān went to the palace with safety and made all deserving persons happy by the distribution of votive offerings and charities.

After a few days he summoned the *amirs* of the marches and with a well equipped army advanced to conquer the fort of Junagadh and the hill of Karnal. He distributed five *krors* of gold in the course of a night and day among his soldiers and included amongst these were two thousand and five *Turki* and *Iraqi* and Arab horses the prices of some of which amounted to as much as twelve thousand *tanlas* each which were bestowed on the men. He also distributed five thousand jewelled swords and seven hundred jewelled belts and one thousand and five daggers with gold and embossed scabbards. When he arrived in the country of Sorath by successive rapid marches he sent detachments in every direction to plunder and devastate (the country). Ray Mandalik in a state of extreme humility and helplessness waited on him and represented that this slave (he himself) had lived a whole life time within the bounds of allegiance and fealty and no act which might have the least suspicion of any breach of engagement or promise had been committed by him. He was also at the present moment prepared to pay any tribute which His Majesty might order. The Sultan said: All my energies are at present directed to raise the standards of Islam in this country after bringing it into my possession so that the institutions of Islam might be established here. I have no other object in view except the introduction of Islam and the capture of the fort.

When Ray Mandalik understood from the purport of these words that this army with other armies was ready to conquer the

¹ O e MS and the lith ed has *حباب* chaity but the other MS has *سکرانہ* thanks offering

² The meaning of the sentence *ما د* is not clear. The sentence is the same in both MSS and in the lith ed except that

country, he waited for an opportunity, and fled at night and retired into the fort of ¹ Jūnāgarh. The next day the Sultān moved forward, and encamped close to the citadel of Jūnāgarh. One detachment separated from the army, and advanced on the fort. A body of Rājput̃s sallied out, and after fighting fled. The next day also there was some fighting, and on the third day the Sultān himself attacked the fort, and there was severe fighting from morning to evening. On the 4th day the Sultān's pavilion was raised near the gate, and the fort was closely besieged, and covered passages were laid down from all sides. The Rājput̃s at all times sallied out of the fort, and made violent attacks, and many good men were slain. For instance, they fell on a particular day on the battery of 'Ālām Khān Fāiūqī, and made a martyr of him. Sultān Mahmūd made the siege such a close one, that the stones thrown by the ballistas sometimes fell in front of the Sultān's throne. Although Rāj Mandalik made proposals of peace and of the payment of tribute, they had no effect whatever as the Sultān had determined on the conquest of the fort.

In the end, Rāj Mandalik, in his extreme humility and distress, prayed for mercy, and after surrendering the fort, took shelter with all his Rājput̃s in the ² hill of Karnāl. Sultān Mahmūd performed the rite of offering thanks, and occupied himself with settling the affairs of the country. After some days, he laid siege to the hill of Karnāl. In the end, Rāj Mandalik, having no other alternative,

the lith. ed. has by mistake ماند instead of نماید. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has exactly the same words, except that it has instead لسكرنا لسكرهای نار دیگر.

¹ The Cambridge History of India, page 305, says, Rāj Mandalak retired to his citadel Uparkot. Uparkot of course means upper citadel, but I have not seen the place, to which Rāj Mandalik retired, called Uparkot in any other history. It is called Jūnāgarh in the other histories.

² Firishtah calls it the fort of Karnāl, and he adds شروع در دردی و راهرنی کردد. This is however not mentioned in any other history, not even in Col Briggs's translation. The Mirāt-i Sikandarī however (Bayley, page 188) says that every day they sallied out and fought, and although Firishtah says that the Sultān became very angry, and himself led an attack on Karnāl, and seized it, his subsequent treatment of Rāj Mandalik does not make it very probable that the latter had committed theft and robbery.

joined the service of the Sultan and having prayed for the safety of his men surrendered the hill of Karnal also. ¹After this as he for several days went every day and waited on the Sultan and observed his pleasant manners and his praise worthy morals he submitted one day that from the auspicious effect of the society of Shah Shams ud din Darvish the love of Islam and of Musalmans had had a great effect on his mind and now that he had been attending on the Sultan and had become cognizant of the truth of the faith of Islam he wished that he should join the Muslim community. Sultan Mahmud with great eagerness taught him the creed of the unity of God and conferred the title of Khan Jahan on him. And in order that the institutions of Islam should be current in that country he laid the (first) brick for building the city of Mustafa abad in the ground and he ordered all the *amirs* that they should lay the foundations of mansions for their residence there. In a short time the city of Mustafa abad became a model of Ahmadabad.

When the *amirs* and the soldiers took up their residence in Mustafa abad everywhere where there were thieves and disturbers of the peace round about Ahmadabad they raised their heads and began to commit thefts and highway robberies and the roads by which people went about from place to place became closed. When this news reached Sultan Mahmud he conferred the title of Muhafiz Khan on Malik Jamal ud din son of Shaikh Malik who was the *lotual* of the camp (provost marshal) and who was entrusted with

¹ *The Mirat Sikandar* (Bayley p 190) give another version of the story of the conversion of Rao Mandal k. According to this he went in attendance on the Sultan to Ahmadabad. One day he went to Rasulabad where his Holiness Shah Alam lived and is buried. He saw many horses and elephants and men assembled there and inquired what *amir* lived there. He was told that at His Holiness Shah Alam resided there. He went and saw him and was converted by him. It may be mentioned here as an extremely curious fact that according to Ras Mala Row Munduleek who was throughout his life so unremittingly persecuted by the Musalmans was as Khan Jel in worshipped under the guise of a Muslimant by the descendants of the men who had persecuted him at his tomb in Ahmadabad up to the time when Ras Mala was published in 1806 and may be worshipped up to the present day. (See R. Mala vol I page 35.)

² The word کرنوال appears to me to be incorrect although it is found in the MSS. and also in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of *Fishtaḥ*. I would either insert the word ہدۃ before کرنوال or change کرنوال to کرنوالی.

the supervision of the *silāh dhāna* (stores of arms and ammunition), and gave him a standard and a ¹ trumpet and sent him to Ahmadābād after investing him with the post of *shahna* and *kotuāl* (Superintendent of manners and morals and of police) of that place.

Malik Jamāl-ud-dīn, Muhāfiz Khān put the city of Ahmadābād into such order as the heart could wish for, within a short time and had five hundred thieves hanged. As this work of his met with the approbation of the Sultān, he had other appointments conferred on him, and the office of the *istifa-i-mumālīk* was added to his other offices and ² gradually his affairs reached to such a position, that one thousand and seven hundred horses were collected in his stables.

¹ The word is طاس in both MSS, and فرطاس in the lith ed. Firishtah has كريا instead.

² The whole of the passage about the appointment of Malik Jamāl ud dīn, and the increase of his power down to the end of the paragraph is copied almost *verbatim* by Firishtah, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 57) in his translation makes certain changes. Instead of the 1700 horses in his stable he mentions 1,700 "bargeer-khass", or persons equipped by him, and riding his own stable horses. He also says that his powers were so little under control, that his son, "in the absence of the king, marched without orders, and obliged the Rays of Idur, Wagur and Serohy, to pay him tribute." This might have been correct, but neither Nizām ud dīn nor Firishtah explicitly says so. According to the *Muāt-i Sikandarī* (Bayley, page 192), "His son exacted tribute from the rebellious chiefs who had never paid it before." It appears also from a note on the same page that there is probably some MS of Firishtah, which contains statements identical with those made by Col Briggs. Bayley however quotes from Col Briggs, and attributes the statement of Firishtah (see the note *, page 194). The Cambridge History of India (page 306) says something quite different. According to it, while Mahmūd "was besieging Gūnār, Jai Singh, the son of Gangādās of Champānēr had been committing systematic brigandage and highway robbery in the country between his stronghold and Ahmadābād. He therefore sent Jamāl-ud dīn Muhammad, conferring on him the title of Muhāfiz Khān to govern this tract, and he put down thieving and highway robbery with such a firm hand, that the inhabitants, we are told slept with open doors." This is not quite correct, Malik Jamāl-ud dīn, or Muhāfiz Khān was appointed *kotuāl* and *shahna* of the city of Ahmadābād, and not governor of the country between that city and Chāmpānēr. There is nothing said in any of the histories of any connection between Jai Singh and the thieves and robbers, except that he allowed the rebels of Barōda and Dabhoī to pass through his territory, and Malik Jamāl ud dīn is not said to have had anything to do with him except that he waited on the Sultān, when the latter was marching against Jai Singh, and was appointed the *vazīr*.

and wherever there was a good soldier he was included among his retainers. His power and splendour reached such a height that his son Mīlik Khidr extorted tribute from the Rajas of Bakar and Idar and Sirohi.

In the beginning of 876 AH 1471 AD it was reported to the Sultan that Jai Singh the son of Gangdas Raja of Champaṇir having become proud by the help and patronage of Sultan Chhīṭh ud-dīn of Malwa had allowed the rebels of Baroda and Dabohi a passage through his territory and had the disposition of raising a rebellion. The Sultan marched from Mustafābād and advanced to punish him. On the way Muhafiz Khan had the honour of writing upon him and the appointment of *ta'ir* was added to that of *lotwal*. He left his deputies to perform the duties of the *lotwal* and occupied himself with the affairs of the *ta'arat*.

When the Sultan heard of the disturbances created by the *amin dars* of Kach (Cutch) and their persecution of the Musalmans was reported to him the Sultan gave up the determination to conquer Champaṇir and marched against that country with a large army. When he arrived ¹ on the edge of the saline country which is known as the Ran he made a very rapid march and in the course of one day traversed a distance of sixty *karohs*. Out of his total army not more than ² six hundred horsemen were with him at the end of the

¹ Firsihtah has *موسوم برآست* instead of *موسوم رسد که* which Col Briggs (vol IV p 80) has translated as *came suddenly upon the enemy's encampment at Sheevur*. It appears from Firsihtah that this part of Cutch was contiguous to Sind and was inhabited by people whom he calls *ماجنان* Majnan. According to the Cambridge History of India page 306 the place is what is now known as the Thar and Pakharli tract.

² There is some doubt as to the possibility of a march of that length in the course of one day as in the text or *سنانه روز* or a night and a day as in Firsihtah though Bayley quoting Col Briggs makes it without a halt in a note on page 193 and comes to the conclusion that it is impossible to cover the distance in one day but it is possible though hardly likely to do so in one day and a night. I should note here also that both MSS have sixty *karohs* as the length of the march but the lithed has sixty one *karohs* and it appears from the note in Bayley that the MS which he had had sixty one *karoh*.

³ One MS and the lithed has six hundred horsemen but the other MS has three hundred. Firsihtah lithed has six hundred but Col Briggs (vol IV

march When he reached the other side of that dangerous country, the enemy could be seen before them They say that there were twenty-four thousand archers The Sultān, in spite of the fact that he had such a small number of men, and the enemy were in such large numbers, dismounted and aimed himself When the enemy saw the boldness and gallantry of the Sultān, they ¹ came forward with sincerity, and made excuses for their offences The Sultān drew the pen of forgiveness across their offences, and made peace with them, after taking a large subsidy He also took some of their chiefs with him to Mustafa-ābād, and taught them the tenets of Islām and Musālmanī, and making everyone of them happy with largesses and favours gave them permission to go back He granted a suitable *jāgīr* to each one of them, and retained those in his service who of their own free will chose to remain with him

In the year 877 A H (1472 A D), it was reported to the Sultān, that forty thousand turbulent and refractory archers had collected together in the neighbourhood of the country of Sind, and ² were harassing (the inhabitants of) the towns and villages on the border He equipped an army and again turned in that direction When he

p 58) has "only three hundred cavalry" He makes the enemy consist of four thousand archers, though Firishtah like Nizām-ud dīn has twenty-four thousand The Cambridge History of India, page 306 gives the correct number, but makes them horse (horsemen) instead of archers

¹ Firishtah's account of what happened, when the Sultān with his six hundred horsemen met the archers, agrees generally with that in the text, but he says that the hostile men became confused and frightened and the chiefs came forward with swords and shrouds hanging from their necks Col Briggs has a somewhat different account He says they were defeated, and numbers of them were slain, after which the remainder came forward with their weapons slung round their necks to implore for mercy The accounts in the *Mirāt i Sikandarī* (Bayley, p 194) and the Cambridge History of India (p 306) agree generally with that in the text, but Bayley quotes in a note Col Briggs's account and attributes it to Firishtah

² The Cambridge History of India page 306, has forty thousand "rebels had risen against Jām Nizām-ud-dīn, the ruler of Sind", but neither the *Tabaqāt* nor Firishtah nor the *Mirāt i Sikandarī* mentions Jām Nizām-ud dīn. On the contrary they say that 40,000 men were harassing the residents of the parts of Gujrāt adjacent to their country

arrived in the salt country he ordered that¹ each horseman should take two horses with him and take with him water and food for seven days. Then relying on divine help he entered into that dangerous country and traversed a distance of sixty *karohs* each day. When he arrived in the country of Sind - the rebels became scattered and dispersed and there was no sign or vestige left of them. The country of Sind now came into his possession without any hindrance. Some of the *amirs* submitted that they had traversed all that distance with very great trouble and it was right that a ruler (*hakim*) and a superintendent (*darogha*) should be left in the country. The Sultan replied as the *Makhduma* : Jahan was descended from the Sultans of Sind in the line of chieftainship and royalty the consideration of the rights of relationship was incumbent on him and it appeared very far from kindness and humanity to seize their territory. He hunted as far as the bank of the Indus and returned to Muṣṭafa ābad.

After a time the resolution to conquer the port of² Jagat which is a place of worship of the Brahmans entered the Sultan's mind. But owing to the narrowness and the difficulty of the road he deferred carrying it out. It happened however that one day a learned man (*fadil*) of the name of³ Maulana Muhammad Samarqandi

¹ One MS and the lith. ed. have هر سوار each horseman but the other MS has هزار سوار one thousand horsemen. Firishtah also has یک هزار سوار حالای one thousand active horsemen.

The account of what happened is more circumstantial and somewhat different in Firishtah but it does not add very much to our information. According to Firishtah the inhabitants were Baluchis they concealed themselves but some of them were dragged out and killed and their camp was plundered. The *Cambridge History of India* page 306 says that before the Sultan returned he received gifts and a letter of thanks from the Jam who also sent his daughter who was married to Qasar Khan grand son of Hasan Khan Iftikhar ul Mulk of Khandel who had taken refuge in Gujarat. For the account given in the *Mirat-i Sikandari* see Bayley page 195.

² Jagat appears to be identical with Dwarka. In the *Mirat-i Sikandari* the name is associated with Sankhodhar and in *Ras Mala* with Beyt. The country according to a note in Bayley page 195 was called Okémandal and the Rajputs as they are to day were Paghars and Waghars a poor but brave and hardy race much given to piracy and robbery.

³ Col Briggs (vol IV p 60) describes him as one of the most learned philosopher of his age but the *Mirat-i Sikandari* Bayley page 195 describes

some with his two sons with their heads and feet bare and waited on the Sultān, and submitted that they had embarked in a ship to go from the Deccan to Samarcand, and were sailing towards Hormuz (Ormuz) that when they arrived opposite to Jagat, a body of men came out in boats filled with weapons of war, blocked their way, plundered them, and carried away the women and children of the Musalmāns into imprisonment.¹ Among them he and his sons had also been imprisoned. Sultān Mahmūd showed kindness to the Maulānā, and sent him to Ahmadābād, and fixed an allowance on him. At the time of bidding him farewell, he told him, "You rest assured, that whatever has been taken from you will be returned to you in its original condition, and those men will receive condign punishment." Then incited by his sense of shame, and his desire to help (Musalmāns), he sent for the *amīrs* and the chiefs of the different sections to attend on him, and said to them, "If on the day on which inquest will be made of our actions, they ask me, 'In your neighbourhood the *kāfirs* committed such oppression, and in spite of your having the power to stop it, you procrastinated', what reply shall I give?" The *amīrs* opened their lips for prayer and praise, and² said, "These slaves have nothing to do except to carry out your orders, and the destruction of these people is incumbent and due on our spirits."

The Sultān being confirmed in his determination, moved out on the 16th Dhī-hijjah of that year towards³ Jagat, and when with very great hardship on account of the narrowness of the way, and the dense jungle, they arrived at Jagat, the infidels fled to the island

him as "a man skilled in the rules and practice of poetry." The Cambridge History of India, page 306, calls him a learned poet and merchant. Bayley interprets the sentence, I think incorrectly, by saying that Maulānā Muhammad's literary name or *non de plume* was Fāzili.

¹ According to Firishtah the Maulānā told the Sultān that his wife was still in the custody of the *Kāfirs*. According to Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Bayley, page 196, "the pirates turned the Mullā (as he is called there) and his two sons adrift, but kept his women, his property and the ship." As the boys were of tender age, the Mullā had to carry them by turns, and in this way he traversed the distance of seventy *kōs*, and came to the Sultān.

² According to Firishtah the *amīrs* were tired of the annual expeditions undertaken by the Sultān.

³ One MS. inserts بدر, port, before Jagat. - ٢٤ Jakat in the text edition.

¹ of Beyt Many snakes appeared there At the place where the Sultan's pavilion had been put up seven hundred snakes were killed in the space of one *pahar* Many tigers and lions and wolves caused much loss to the men in the island and many of the wild animals were also killed They ravaged the temple of Jagat and pulled it down Sultan Mahmud had to wait there for four months at this place and during this time many boats were prepared to carry the soldiers and the artillery and then they started for the island of Beyt The men in the island embarked in boats and advanced to fight but in the end they retreated to the island The brave warriors (of the Sultan's army) drove the ships and threw themselves into the island and having captured the citadel of Beyt slew a vast number of Rajputs The Raja of the place who had the name of Ray Bhim got into a boat and fled to some place The Sultan embarked a number of his men in boats and sent them in pursuit of him He himself entered the city of Beyt and released all the Musalmans who were imprisoned there He got much plunder and an enormous number of prisoners of war He left Malik Tughan who had the title of Farhat ul mulk as the *thanadar* of the place and crowned with success and victory ² returned to Mustafa abad On Friday the 13th of

¹ Both MSS and the 1th ed of F rishtah have بے Byet but the 1th ed of the Tabaqat has سکوندھار Shakundhar The two appear to be names of the same island

² The MSS as well as the 1th ed have سنرو و بولنگ Col Briggs (vol IV p 61) has lions leopards and wolves As to the number of snakes killed F rishtah (1th ed) also says that seven hundred were killed in the course of one *pahar* Col Briggs however has seventy killed in a day and says in a note that the number would not appear to be exaggerated to any one who has been in India The Mirat i Shikandari also says that seven hundred snakes were killed in one night within the royal enclosure According to the Cambridge History of India (p 307) the Sultan moved from Jagat or Dwarika to Aramura at the extreme N W point of the peninsula and it was here that the army was troubled by lions and venomous snakes and insects The Mirat i Shikandari (Bayley p 196) mentions the village of Aramrah and Bayley says in a note that the name is variously spelt in the different MSS

³ According to F rishtah Ray Bhim was seized and brought before the Sultan before the latter left for Mustafa abad and he was taken to that place At Mustafa abad the Sultan ordered that a letter be written to the Maulana but while the letter was being written he arrived and his wife and children were

Jamīdī-ul-āwwal of the aforementioned year, the men who had gone in pursuit of Rāy Bhīm brought him under arrest and in fetters, and made him stand in front of the Sultān's hall of audience. The Sultān sent for Maulānā Muhammad Samarkandī from Ahmadābād, and sent the wretched and miserable Bhīm Rāy to Muhāfiz Khān, so that he might cut him up into four strips, and hang them up at the four sides of the city of Ahmadābād, so that other turbulent men might be terrified by the sight.

¹ In the month of Rajab of that year (874 A H), the Sultān left a number of his officers at Muṣṭafa-ābād, and started towards the fort of Chāmpānīr. On the way he received the news that a body

made over to him. Rāy Bhīm was also made over to him, to do what he liked with him, and the Maulānā asked the Sultān, that he should be made over to Muhāfiz Khān, and should be taken round the city and killed with torture. Col Briggs's account is slightly different. The Cambridge History of India does not say that the Maulānā's wife and children were returned to him, but he was asked to identify his property out of the immense quantity of plunder and he was given all that he identified, besides some big presents. Raja Bhīm was also made over to him but he returned the raja, and he was sent to Ahmadābād, and impaled (p. 307).

¹ The account of this incident as given in *Firishtah* (lith. ed.) does not differ materially from the text. The date is ٨٨٧ مائة و ثمانمائة سنة وسبع in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*, which is defective as in the words, the word for the tens is omitted. In figures the year is 887, and in Col Briggs's translation the year is 887 A H and 1482 A D. In the Cambridge History of India, page 307, the attack on the Malabar pirates is said to have taken place between October 1473 and January 1474, i.e., about 8 years before the date given by Col Briggs. The correct year would be 877 A H, اربعه و سبعين و ثمانمائة, as given in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt*. There are some details in *Firishtah* not mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn such as the fact that the Sultān's men were armed with **توب و تهاگ و بیرو کمان**. Col Briggs's account (vol. IV, p. 65) differs a great deal. He calls the Mālābārians Bulsar pirates, and he says that they had gained such an ascendancy at sea, as to threaten the invasion of his dominions, and had already intercepted the trade. The *Mirāt-ı Sikandarī*'s (Bayley, p. 199) account is different, as it does not appear from it that the Sultān himself embarked on board his ships, and a battle was fought with the pirates, but Bayley in a note quotes the *Tabaqāt* about the Sultān having commanded the fleet and fought a battle. He also says that according to *Firishtah* the pirates were of Bulsar. The Cambridge History of India, page 307, says that the Malabar pirates made a descent on his coasts.

of ¹Malabarīs had collected a large number of boats and were harassing people travelling by sea. Immediately on hearing this news (the Sultan) arranged some ships and himself with a body of brave warriors embarked in them and relying on divine help and victory lifted the anchors. When they arrived near the ships of the Malabarīs the latter fled and some of their boats fell into his hands. He then sailed to the port of Kanbayat and disembarked there. He returned to the capital city of Ahmadabad in the month of Sha ban. At the end of Ramadan he raided a part of the country of Champanir and again returned to Ahmadabad.

³ In the year 875 A.H. the Sultan sent Malik Baha ud din Imad ul mulk to the *thana* in the town of ⁴Sonkhir and Qawam ul mulk to that in the town Kodhra. Farhat ul mulk to the *thana* at fort Beyt and Jagat and Malik Nizam ul mulk to the *thana* at ⁵Kiz and

¹ ساربان traders in the text edition

This sentence is to be found in one MS and in the lith ed but is omitted from the other MS. The Sultan said to have returned to Ahmadabad according to both the MSS and the lith ed but it is more likely that he went to Mustafaabad.

³ Nizam ud din does not give the reasons of these appointments. It appears from Firishtah that the people (*amirs*?) were tired of the continual expeditions of the Sultan and with the order to change their residence from Ahmadabad to Mustafaabad and were in a mood to rebel. So the Sultan made these appointments so that the *amirs* might keep their *thanas* in order and he himself might have the leisure to organise the administration of the newly acquired territory of Karnal or Sorath. Col Briggs says briefly that the Shah conceived his dominions to be too extensive for his own immediate management. The Cambridge History of India also refers to the tireless energy and ceaseless activity of the Sultan which had become wearisome to his soldiers and officers. I may point out here that the Cambridge History of India page 307 suddenly jumps in the course of about half a dozen lines from January 1474 to December 1480.

⁴ سونگھر in the text edition

⁵ This name is کنر in one MS is illegible in the other and کانر Kanir in the lith ed. In the lith ed of Firishtah it is کنر Kanir. According to Col Briggs (vol IV p 6) Nizamool Moolk was sent to Tanna. The Cambridge History of India does not give the names of the governors and of their stations کناسر in the text edition.

appointed ¹ Khudāwand Khān to be the *vazīr* of the kingdom, and left him in attendance on Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān at Ahmadābād. He occupied himself with the administration of Jūnāgarh and the surrounding country.

One day Khudāwand Khān, owing to his sincere attachment and intimacy with the Rāy ² Rāyān, told him in private “³ I am much aggrieved at the many activities of Sultān Mahmūd. Not a single year or a month passes, that he does not take up an enterprise and does not march the army about. If with your own men, and taking five hundred of my soldiers with you, you go to the house of ‘Imād-ul-mulk and get him out of the way, we can to-morrow raise Shāhzāda

¹ Firishtah says Khudāwand Khān, who was the *vazīr*, was made the *atālīq* or guardian of Shāhzāda Muẓaffar Khān, and was left at Ahmadābād. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 62) calls him Khudabunda Khan “preceptor of the Prince Moozuffur Khan.” The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* agrees with the *Tabaqāt*, and Bayley in a note says that the *Tabakāt* and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* are correct as to the name of the prince, but he says that Firishtah says that Khudābandah Khān was made governor of Ahmadābād which is certainly not correct. But Bayley always means Col Briggs when he says Firishtah. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Khudāwand Khān was induced by some designing men to acquiesce in the conspiracy (Bayley, p. 201).

² His name does not appear, but as his title implies, and as the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) says, he was the chief Hindu noble.

³ Firishtah does not give the conversation between Khudāwand Khān and the Rāy Rāyān, but goes on at once to say that they sent for ‘Imād-ul-mulk and other nobles to Ahmadābād, and after swearing ‘Imād-ul-mulk on the *Qurān* made them join the conspiracy. ‘Imād ul-mulk joined it, as he did not have his soldiers with him. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*’s account is very brief, and Bayley considered the account in the *Tabakāt* had such details, and the matter was of such importance, as explaining the reasons why Prince Ahmad was passed over, that he has incorporated a translation of it in his book. I find, however, that his translation is not quite correct, if he made it from a text which was identical with mine, for instance he says that Khudāwand Khān told Rāy Rāyān, if I were to take my own followers and five hundred soldiers to ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s house, I could easily get him out of the way.

The account of the conspiracy as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 308, agrees with that in the text, except that it says that the Rāy Rāyān refused to be a party to ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s death. I do not know whether he would have actually refused, but all that the text says is that he believed that he would be able to gain him over, and that the conspirators would be all the stronger by his joining them.

Ahmad Khan to the *saltanat* For killing Imad ul mulk we will not have a better time (than this) when all his retainers have gone to his *thana* I have submitted this matter to Shahzida Ahmad Khan and he agrees with me and is willing to join us The Ray Ravan said

Imad ul mulk is sincerely attached to me and tells me all his private matters As he is all aggrieved with the Sultan and has complaints against him it is extremely likely that he would join with us in this matter and by his union with us our plans will acquire a new strength Although Khudawand Khan forbade the Ray Ravan to communicate with Imad ul mulk it was of no avail The Ray Ravan relying on the friendship and affection of Imad ul mulk at first swore him in private on the *Quran* that he would not disclose this secret and later brought the matter into discussion As Imad ul mulk saw that his men had gone to his *jagir* on the spur of the moment he signified his consent and said In this matter I am at one with Khudawand Khan but it appears to me that as Ramadan is drawing to a close we should attempt to carry out our intention after it is over The Ray Ravan was pleased (with this suggestion) and communicated the message to Khudawand Khan

After the Ray Ravan had gone away Imad ul mulk sent for ¹ Malik Miyan to come to him in private and said to him In Sultan Qutb ud din's time I used to desire that I might have a second horse and I could not have it and now owing to the greatness of Sultan Mahmud there is not a greater man than myself in his service He immediately wrote a letter to Malik Farhat ul mulk who had encamped in the town of Sarkhet and asked him to come and meet him He also sent a letter to Malik Qayam ul mulk at ² Rakhial that he should not march from that place for some days Early the next morning Malik Farhat ul mulk arrived at Imad ul mulk's house with five hundred horsemen They had an interview for a little while and then Malik Farhat ul mulk was sent to his own house After a time Imad ul mulk sent for Muhfiz Khan the *kotwal* of the city and said to him As there is relationship between us it is right

¹ *میریدیل* in the text edition

² Contrary to this Firishtah says he sent for his own troop

³ The name of the place is printed as Rakhial by Bayley also but he has (*) after it (p. 33) *رکھنال* in the text edition

that we should ¹ endeavour to do good to each other. Your loyalty consists in your being present to attend to the affairs of the city, lest a disturbance should be created. On the day of the *‘Īd*, you should be ready with your followers and retainers, and attend on Prince Ahmad Khān at the ² *maslā*, and till midday you should make every endeavour to guard the city.”

Khudāwand Khān on hearing the words (the news [?]) became anxious in his mind. He sent for Rāy Rāyān to his presence, and said (to him), “Did I not tell you, that ‘Imād-ul-mulk would not agree with us in this matter. Now things have come to such a pass, that all our houses (families) would be ruined.” When the *‘Īd* passed off, and ‘Imād-ul-mulk’s retainers all arrived, ³ Khudāwand Khān did not for fear (or consequences) disclose (his intentions), and his resolution remained in this way unaccomplished. It so happened, however, that after some days, ⁴ a popular rumour reached Mustafā-ābād that Khudāwand Khān had killed ‘Imād-ul-mulk on the day of the *‘Īd*, and all the *amīns* had joined with him, and they had placed Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān on the throne. One of the (amīrs), who were with the Sultān, went with some audacity, and without any hesitation repeated the rumour to him.

¹ The translation in Bayley, page 203, is “we must rival each other in loyalty.” This does not appear to me to be correct.

بیر حواهی does not mean loyalty (to the Sultān), but in the next sentence apparently means loyalty to him.

² I do not know what the meaning of ماسلا is. The translation in Bayley, page 203, does not say where he was to go in attendance on prince Ahmad Khān.

³ The sentence یکی از مقربان گفت که بی تکاشی این خبر سلطان رسید is somewhat cryptic, but the corresponding sentence in Firishtah which is و قریب که از امرای مقرب سلطان بود و در مصطفی آباد خبر اراغی رسید makes the meaning clear.

⁴ According to Firishtah the rumour reached Mustafā-ābād, and Qaisar Khān secretly communicated it to the Sultān, and the latter determined on making a secret investigation. The Cambridge History of India, page 308, says “Qaisar Khān Fārūqī, who was at Ahmadābād, privately informed the king of the affair, so that it came to naught.” It does not appear, however, that Qaisar Khān was at Ahmadābād, or that he knew the real facts, and the Sultān did not know them till some time afterwards, when he got ‘Imād ul-mulk to divulge them.

¹ Immediately on hearing this news the Sultan sent for Qaisar Khan and Firuz Khan to his private chamber and said The news of the illness of the Shahzada had come before this and to dry my mind is very sad as to what has happened to him Go out a distance of two *karohs* and come back with correct and detailed news from anyone (when you may meet) who should be coming from Ahmadabad When Malik Sa'id ul mulk had gone a part of the way he saw one of his own relations who was coming from Ahmadabad He asked him how things were there He said I was in Ahmadabad on the day of the 3rd Id i Itr The Shahzada came to make his *namaz* and Khudawand Khan and Muhafiz Khan were in attendance at the *darbar* When the Shahzada went back to the palace Muhafiz Khan was present at the *darbar* till two *pahars* of the day had passed But the men of the city say that Imad ul mulk does not give his permission that the *amirs* should go to their *thanas* and they are all at their houses Malik Sa'id ul mulk came back and reported all that he heard The Sultan said A man had told me a falsehood to the effect that the Shahzada had been ill After two or three days he sent for Qaisar Khan and Firuz Khan into his private chamber and having told them the whole ⁴ story said I will tell people that I intend to go on a pilgrimage to the *Hijaz* Whoever approves of this determination of mine I shall know that he does not want me After some days he gave orders that ships should be made ready and he gave some *lakhs* of *tankas* to the superintendent of the ship so that he might buy things that would be required in Mecca for devotional offerings He then went from Mustafa abad to the port

¹ The account in the *Mirat i Sikandari* (Bayley p. 100) agrees with the text but Firsiht and the Cambridge History of India page 308 without giving any of the intermediate incidents at once go on to say that the Sultan wanted to give out that he was going on a pilgrimage to Mecca

According to the *Mirat i Sikandari* Bayley page 104 the Sultan told Kaim Khan and Firuz Khan to send Malik Sa'id ul Mulk to find out the true facts The name is Sa'id ul mulk in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqat* in one place and Sa'id ul mull in another but it is Sa'id ul mulk in both MSS

² The *Id* of the opening or breaking of the fast of Ramadan which takes place on the 1st Shawwal

⁴ It is not clear how he got hold of it or how much he knew

of ¹ Ghōgha, embarked in the boats, and disembarked at the port of Kanbāyat

When this news reached Ahmadābād, all the *amīns* ² hastened to wait on the Sultān. The latter said that the Shāhvāda had come to a good age (*buzung shudah*), and the *amīns* have been trained as the heart might desire. "My mind is composed about the welfare of the kingdom, and it has occurred to me that I should now obtain the happiness of the *Haq*." 'Imād-ul-mulk said, "Your Majesty should go once to Ahmadābād, and then do whatever may appear to be proper." The Sultān knew that the ³ cup is only half filled, and proceeded towards Ahmadābād. When he arrived in the city, he sent one day for all the *amīns*, and said, "Please give me permission that I might come back after performing the *Haq*, as long as you do not give a reply, ⁴ I shall not have any desire for food." The *amīns* knew that the Sultān was testing them. All of them placed the seal of silence on their mouths. When the great luminary reached the meridian, 'Imād-ul-mulk said to the *amīns*, "The Sultān is hungry, some reply should be given to him." ⁵ Nizām-ul-mulk went and waited

¹ The name is **کھوکھ** in the text edition

² Firishtah and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* agree, but the Cambridge History of India, page 308, says that the nobles were summoned from Ahmadābād to Cambay to consider this proposal, i.e., the proposal of the Sultān that he should go on a pilgrimage

³ The sentence in both MSS, and the lith. ed. is **کہ دریں کاسہ دم کاسہ** Firishtah has a slightly different sentence **مکہ ریر کاسہ دم کاسہ**

⁴ This is a curious and very early instance of a hunger strike

⁵ Both the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* and the Cambridge History of India make Nizām ul Mulk the spokesman of the *amīns*, and attribute the speech to him, but Firishtah assigns it to 'Imād ul mulk. Nizām ul mulk is called in the Cambridge History of India (p. 308) *Nizām-ul-Mulk Aisan*, and is described as the oldest courtier. It would appear, however, that Firishtah is right, and the others are wrong. The fact that 'Imād ul mulk suggested to Nizām ul-mulk later, that as he was the oldest, he should go to the Sultān confirms it. This also appears from Firishtah. If Nizām-ul mulk had first gone to the Sultān there would be no necessity to ask him to go a second time on the ground that he was the oldest of the *amīns*. Besides it is not likely that the Sultān would have said to Nizām-ul mulk, that the government of the country could not go on in his absence. He could have only said this to 'Imād ul-mulk. As to the name of Nizām-ul-mulk I have not seen it with the affix *Aisan* anywhere else, but in

on the Sultān and submitted. As the Shihzadā has reached the stage of perfection and the son of this slave Malik Bādah has acquired much experience and knows how to endure the heat and cold of the times this slave hopes that the *thana* of this slave should be made over to the slave's son and that Your Majesty would not leave this slave behind him when he goes on the auspicious pilgrimage.¹ The Sultān said: It is a great good fortune if it can be secured but the government of the country cannot go on without you.² Go and bring a plain answer from the *amirs*. Nizām ul mull went back to the *amirs* and repeated what had happened but no one attempted to give a reply. When Imād ul mull saw that no one would give an answer and the Sultān was starving he said to Nizām ul mull:

As you are the most senior in age among all of us friends it would be better if you would go on behalf of all of us and would submit that the Lord of the world should first conquer the fort of Champanir where he might leave his treasures and the inmates of his harem behind in safety and then he could turn his attention to the acquisition

the lith ed of Firishtah in the passage in which the illness and death of Imād ul mull are mentioned he is called *عن عماد الملك* Afn Imād ul mull. Is the Aisan of the Cambridge History of India a mistake for Afn and I have it been given to Nizām ul mull by mistake instead of to Imād ul mull?

The name of the *amir's* son is given in the MSS of the Tabaqat as Malik Bādah. The lith ed has Malik but omits Bādah. It is not given in any other history in this place but it is given as Bādah on page 309 of the Cambridge History of India and as Malik Bādā in Bayley page 209. The word which I have translated as experience is *تجارب* merchandise or trade in both MSS and in the lith ed. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in inserting the correct word *تجارب*. Apparently there was the same mistake in the Mirat al Silandari and it puzzled the translator who has rendered it: I have acquired wealth by trading and am well acquainted with the sea-sons and then adds in a note: this sentence is doubtful (Bayley p. 105).

¹ The Cambridge History of India page 308 says: it was now Mahmūd's turn to be at a loss. I do not think he was very much at a loss.

The reading in both MSS and in the lith ed is *بی وجود او*. I think *بی وجود تو* is more correct and Firishtah has *بی وجود تو*. So I have taken the liberty to correct the text and this is followed in the text edition.

² The word *برو* go is not in the MSS but is in the lith ed.

of the good fortune of circumambulating (the sacred places)" (The Sultān) said, "If God so wills, it comes to pass" He then sent for his food, and partook of it But he summoned Qaiṣar Khān into his private chamber, and said, "Imād-ul-mulk does not tell me the truth I have determined that I shall not speak to him till he discloses the truth"

When a few days passed in this way, one day Imad-ul-mulk said to the Sultān in private, "This slave does not know what offence he has committed" The Sultān replied, "Until you tell the truth I shall not speak to you" He replied, "They made me swear on the *Qur'ān*" The Sultān said, "If in the discharge of your loyal duties, your life goes, you should say let it go" Imād-ul-mulk then having no other alternative reported the whole of the truth Sultān Mahmūd acted with great forbearance, the only penalty which he inflicted on Khudāwand Khān was this, that he gave the name of Khudāwand Khān to one of his ¹ pigeons After a time he went to Nahīwāla, and from that place he sent Imād-ul-mulk to conquer Jālōr and ² Sājōr, and he sent Qaiṣar Khān with him Imād-ul-mulk on receiving leave to go, encamped near the tomb of Shaikh Hājī Rajab, may his soul be sanctified³ In the night ³ Mujāhid Khān, son of Khudāwand Khān, in concert with Sāhib Khān his cousin, came out of his house, and entered the pavilion of Qaiṣar Khān, and murdered

¹ The word کنوتران, pigeons, is printed نوکران, servants, in the lith ed., and Col Briggs apparently having نوکران in the MSS, from which he made his translation, has turned the humorous and whimsical punishment of Khudāwand Khān, whom, by the way, he always calls Khoodabunda Khan into a matter of disgrace to the latter, by causing the person employed in the meanest office of his household to be called by his name Bayley on page 205 says that the Sultān called one of his pigeons Khudāwand Khān, but, as usual, in a note he attributes Col Briggs's statement to Firishtah

² The name is written ساحور in both MSS, and also in the lith ed of Firishtah, but it is ساجور in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt Col Briggs (vol IV, p 64) has Julwara and Aboogur in place of Jālōr and Sājōr Bayley (p 206) has Jālōr and Sājōr, but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, has "Sānchor and Jālōr in Marwār"

³ Firishtah agrees that the murder was committed by a son and a nephew of Khudāwand Khān, but the Cambridge History of India, page 309, says that it was committed by his two sons

him Early in the morning Imad ul mulk went to wait on the Sultan and disclosed the truth to him Another man however reported (to the Sultan) that Azdar Khan son of Alf Khan had committed this heinous act The Sultan immediately on hearing this sent Firuz Khan that he should arrest and bring Azdar Khan When night came Mujahid Khan and Sahib Khan fled with their family and children In the morning when it became known that Azdar Khan was innocent and Mujahid Khan and Sahib Khan had murdered Qasr Khan the Sultan ordered that Khudawand Khan should be put in chains and should be made over to Muhafiz Khan and Azdar Khan should be set at liberty After some days the Sultan returned to Ahmadabad and about this time the poor Imad ul mulk bound up the goods of existence (died) The Sultan took pity on his family and gave his eldest son who had the name of ¹ Malik Badeh the title of Ikhtiyar ul mulk and he transferred the duty of the *ta'arat* to Muhafiz Khan

In the year 880 A.H. the people of Gujarat suffered the privations of a failure of the rains and a famine It so happened that ² Malik

¹ See note 1 pp 269 ~ 0 The name is written in the MSS here as *مليك* and *مليك* is printed in the lith ed as *مليك* I have retained the name previously given to him According to Firishtah on Imad ul mulk's death his son Iltibar ul mulk obtained his father's place and became very near (to the Sultan) and having attained to the post of *ta'ar* his affairs reached such a high position that he became the person to whom the high and low all looked up Col Briggs so far as I can see omits all reference to this matter Bayley quotes the *Tabal* at The Cambridge History of India page 309 agrees partially with *Tabaqat* and partly with *Firishtah* According to it on the death of Imad ul Mulik he was succeeded by his son Buda Imad ul Mull

² This is the year in both MSS and in the lith ed According to *Firistah* it was 887 A.H. and according to Col Briggs 88 A.H. 148^o A.D. Bayley gives the same year while the Cambridge History of India briefly refers to a failure of rains and famine

³ He is called Malik Sida Khassiah Khel Sultan who was posted at Morimli otherwise called Rasulabad in the *Muratt* Skandari Bayley page 207 and Bayley says in a note that he is called Malik Sadha in the *Tabal* at Alkha The Cambridge History of India page 309 calls him Malik Sudha governor of Rasulabad who is said there to be 14 miles S.E. of Champanir *Firistah* apparently does not mention him though he says that the Rajputs of Champanir harried the Musalman of Rasulabad

Sadhā had raided certain villages in Chāmpānīr, and ¹ Rāy Batāi, the son of Rāy Uday Singh, Rāja of Chāmpānīr, collected troops and attacked him and in the battle Mahk Sadhā and a body of his followers attained to the rank of martyrdom. Rāy Batāi plundered and carried away two elephants and all goods and equipments belonging to Mahk Sadhā and his men. When this news reached the Sultān, he set out on a march to Chāmpānīr, on the first of the month of Dhī-qaḍah of the aforementioned year, and when by successive marches, he arrived at the town of Barōda, Rāy Batāi, becoming ashamed and repentant of the reprehensible act and wicked deed he had perpetrated sent ambassadors to wait on the Sultān, and petitioned for the pardon of his offences. He also submitted that both the elephants, which had been wounded, had become disabled, but he was willing to send two other elephants loaded with gold. The Sultān replied, "The answer to this message will be given to-morrow by the sword, which cuts like a diamond", and he turned the ambassadors back. He sent in advance of himself Tāj Khān and 'Add-ul-mulk and Bāhrām Khān and Ikhtiyār Khān. They arrived at the foot of the fort on the 27th Safar. The Rājapūts sallied out of the fort every day, and fought from morning to evening with great gallantry.

The Sultān also advanced from the town of Barōda, and passing Chāmpānīr, encamped in the village of ³ Karnārī. He appointed

¹ The name is راي دلائي, Rāy Basāi in the MSS, and Rāy Batāi in the lith ed. It appears to be راي بنامی, Rāy Banāhī in the lith ed of Firishtah. Col Briggs calls him Bany Ray. The Mirāt-i Sikandarī has Rāwāl Patāi. According to Rās Mālā (vol I p 371) his real name was "Jye Singh", or as it should be correctly transliterated Jaya Sinha, which undoubtedly is the right name for the son of Udaya Sinha "and by Firishta" (or rather by Col Briggs) "entitled Beny Ray, and widely known in Hindu tradition under the name of Phutāee Rāwul". In the Cambridge History of India, page 309, he is called Patāi, and it is also stated that he sacked and destroyed Rasūlābād, but I cannot find this anywhere else. Firishtah has been followed in the text edition.

² It is هفتم, 7th in one MS, and in the lith ed, and هجدهم, 17th in the other MS. Firishtah lith ed also has 7th هفتم in the text edition.

³ Both MSS have کرناری, while the lith ed has کرنال. Firishtah lith ed has کرنای, Karnāi, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 67) has "Girnary on the Malwa road".

Sayyid ¹ Badī Alangdar for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions. It so happened that one day when the Sayyid was escorting a convoy of provisions the Rajputs fell on them from an ambush and they slew a body of the troops and carried away all the provisions. The Sultān on hearing this news became very depressed and sad and he sat down at the foot of the fort of Champanīr till the end of Safar of that year and did everything to carry on the siege with great vigour. Muḥaṣiṣ Kḥān mounted every morning and inspected all the batteries till midday and then returning made report of the state of things to the Sultān. When the siege had progressed in a satisfactory and perfect manner, he ordered that covered ways should be laid down from (all) four directions. They say that for every plank that they carried to the top of the hill the wages of the men carrying it amounted to one lakh *tanḳas*. Ray Bataī seeing this state of things and owing to great weakness and exhaustion again sent ambassadors and submitted that he would send a tribute of nine *mans* of gold and of grain which would suffice for feeding the army for two years. The Sultān said: It is impossible that "I should rise from the place till this fort should have been conquered."

When the ambassadors returned despondent Ray Bataī in the year 888 A H sent his experienced *ṭalāl* ² Sura to Sultān Ghīyāth ud dīn Kḥālī and asked for help and undertook to pay one lakh of *tanḳas* for every stage in the march of his army as a contribution to his expenses. Sultān Ghīyāth ud dīn mustered his troops and advanced to and encamped in the town of ⁴ Naḥla. When this news reached the Sultān he left his *amirs* at the different stations and marched himself

¹ The name of this man appears to be *سید بدی الگدار* in the MSS. It is *سیدی لنگ درار* in the lith. ed. He is called *سید بدر* Sayyid Badr in the lith. ed. of Firishtaḥ and Syūl Mudun Lung by Col Briggs (vol IV p 67).

² Both MSS have *ارن سر رمین برحاسین ممکن نسب* but the lith. ed. has *ارن سر رمین ممکن نسب که برحرم*.

³ He is called *سورا* in the MSS and in the lith. ed. Firishtaḥ lith. ed. has *سور*. Col Briggs (vol IV p 67) has Shew Ray and the Mirat-i Sikandari (Bayley p 208) has Sahura and the Cambridge History of India (p 309) Suri.

⁴ The name is written *نعلجه* in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is *لعلجه* Lalja. Firishtaḥ lith. ed. has *نعلجه* Naḥla. The Mirat-i Sikandari (Bayley) Naḥlaḥ.

as far as the town of ¹ Dahūd to meet him. At this place the news reached him, that ² Sultān Gḥḥiyāth-ud-dīn had sent for the learned men one day, and asked for an expression of their opinion on the following point: “a *bādshāh* of the Musalmāns has besieged a hill of the infidels, is it right according to the *Sharaʿ* that I should reinforce and go to help the latter?” The learned men said, “it is not right.” Sultān Gḥḥiyāth-ud-dīn immediately went back to Mandū. The Sultān on hearing this tune (of joyfulness) was delighted, came back to Chāmpānīr, and laid the foundation of a ³ *Jāmaʿ* mosque.

The *amīns* and the *sardārs* now knew for certain, that the Sultān would not leave the place until the fort should be conquered, and made a very great effort in planning the conquest. When the construction of the covered ways was completed, the soldiers in the Sultān's own battery saw one day from the covered way, that most of the Rājputs went away in the morning for cleaning their teeth and for their ablutions, and only a few remained on the bastions. When they reported this to the Sultān he ordered that Qawām-ul-mulk on the following ⁴ day in the year 889 A H, at the true dawn should

¹ The name of the town should be transliterated as Dahūd. Firishtah, lith ed., has دهر, apparently a mistake, Col Briggs has D'har, Bayley (p. 208) has Dahōd, and the Cambridge History of India (p. 309) Dohad.

² Firishtah agrees with this, but Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 68) says that the Sultān “on being reproached by his nobles and officers, for entertaining an intention of marching to the assistance of an infidel” disbanded his army, and returned to Mando.

³ The Cambridge History of India, p. 309, says that the mosque, which still adorns the ruins of the city, was built before Sultān Gḥḥiyās-ud-dīn's offer to aid the Raja. This does not agree with the other histories, according to which the foundations of the mosque were laid after the Sultān's return from Dahūd. The author of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* laments the ruin which had overwhelmed Chāmpānīr during his time. He says (Bayley, p. 212) “Now thanks be to God, Chāmpānīr is not still the same. The buildings are in ruins, it is inhabited by the tiger, and the gardens are for the most part jungle, nor is there any sandal wood produced. Its very name is unknown.” The first sentence is curious. There is, however, no mention of the mosque.

⁴ No date is given in either the MSS. or the lith ed. Only the year is mentioned at this place, but it appears a few sentences further on, that the date was the first of Dhī-qa'dah. Firishtah in the corresponding passage gives neither date nor year. Bayley after giving the account of the capture of Chāmpānīr, says

take the Sultān's own troops with him and should advance his *sabat* (covered way) into the fort. There was every hope that the flag of victory should be unfurled from the flag staff of hope. On the following morning which was the 1st of *Dhī qa dah* Malik Qawam ul mulk with the Sultān's own troops hurled himself from the covered way into the fort and slew a large number of the garrison and a great fight took place. They drove the Rajputs to the gate of the citadel Ray Batai and other Rajputs then prepared for *jauhar* and Qawam ul mulk and the other leaders having the great good fortune of martyrdom before the eyes of their noble spirit lavished all efforts and made every endeavour.

It so happened that a few days before this they had shot a cannon ball on the rampart of the fort from the western side and several cracks and fissures had appeared in the rampart of the great citadel. Malik Āyaz Sultān availing himself of an opportunity went to the crack in the rampart with a body of soldiers from that crack which was in truth the crack by which the angel of the death of the garrison made his entrance. They rushed into the great citadel and by way of the ¹ *barah* ascended to the top of the great gate. At this time Sultān Mahmud came to the top of the *sabat* and placing his face of humility in the dust offered prayers and as victory and triumph still delayed he sent reinforcements. The Rajputs being harassed and discomfited threw bombs filled with gun powder on the roof of the gate. It so happened however that from the seat of divine mercy the breeze of success and victory blew, (the men on the top of the gate) seized those very bombs and threw them into the courtyard of the palace of Ray Batai. When the Rajputs found that things had come to this condition at every place where they had arranged a *jauhar*

that the *Tabakat* and *Firishtah* give a fuller account of how it was seized and proceeds to quote from them. It would appear from his account page 210 that the attack of Qawam ul Mulik was made on the 1st Zī l ka dah 889 A H. The Cambridge History of India does not specially mention this particular incident.

¹ The word بارو *baru* in both MSS. but it is باره *barah* in the lith. ed. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. I have retained *barah* as it occurs in *Imam barah* etc. The translation in Bayley gives no help. It says from that breach they fought the way to the roof of the principal gate. M. H. Dayat Hosain has *barah* in the text edition.

they set fire to them and burnt all their dependent and children. The whole of that day and night and the next day the entire (Muslimān) army remained under arms and fought. On the second day which was the 2nd of Dhī-qa'dah 889 A H, they forced open the door and got into (the citadel) and slew a large number. Sultān Muhammad also advanced as far as the door. A body of the Rājput then threw down their arms and assembled round a reservoir. They all got into the water and washed their bodies and coming out of the water seized their swords, and stood up. As the body of the Sultān's troops went near the reservoir, seven hundred Rājputs at once rushed on them and very large number on both sides were slain but Rāj Batāi and Dūngarsī and a number of others were captured and brought (before the Sultān).

The Sultān performed the ceremony of offering thanks to God and made over Rāj Batāi and Dūngarsī to Muhāfiz Khān, so that he might have their wounds medically attended to. The same day the Sultān gave the name of Muhammadābād to Chāmpānūr and made an entry into it. A number of the Rājputs fled, and entered the third citadel. They were brought down the same day in distress and wretchedness. When Muhāfiz Khān reported that Rāj Batāi's wounds had healed, the Sultān urged ¹ him to accept Islām. He did not agree. After he had been in prison for ² five months and as he did not still accept Islām he and ³ Dūngarsī were by order of the learned men, executed. This occurred in the year 890 A H. In the same year he passed orders for the erection of a special citadel of citadels *Jahān Panāh*, and of palaces and gardens and placed the work in the charge of Muhāfiz Khān. In the year 892 A H, he bestowed the country

¹ Both Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 310) say that Rāj Batāi and Dūngarsī were both invited to accept Islām and both refused.

² According to Firishtah he was in chains during the whole of the five months, and was every day threatened with death.

³ The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says, that the minister Sūrī was executed at the same time, but this does not appear to be mentioned in the *Tabaqāt* or in *Firishtah*, and the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 211) says that the Sultān ordered the execution of the Rāj, and of his minister but whether this refers to Dūngarsī or to Sūrī is not clear.

of Sorath and the forts of Junagarh and Karnal on Shahzada ¹ Khahl Khan

In the year 892 A H (the Christian year is given as 1486 A D) some merchants coming from Dehli arrived in Muhammadabad and complained that they were bringing ³ four hundred and three horses

¹ Firishtah call him the Sultan's سر کوچک or younger son but he is not mentioned by Col Briggs. In the Mirat-i Sikandari he is mentioned on page 116 and it is said in a note that he afterwards became Yuzaffar II. It appears from the Mirat-i Sikandari page 739 that he was the Sultan's fourth son by Rani Harbai daughter of the Tah Ranah a Rajput amindar on the bank of Mahindri. The Rani died the fourth or fifth day after the prince's birth. It is said that immediately after his birth the prince was taken by the Sultan to Hans Bai (the swan like lady as Bayley takes the trouble to explain that her name signifies) the widow of Sultan Muhammad and Sultan Mahmud's step mother. She educated the prince with more than a mother's care and Sultan Muhammad (sic) used to say whenever he saw him 'The line of my kingly ancestors will be carried on by this boy and his descendants'.

It is curious that at least three of Sultan Mahmud's four sons were born of Hindu mothers viz (1) Muhammad Kala whose mother was Rani Iup Manjari who had previously been married to Sultan Kutbuddin and after his death came to Sultan Mahmud. The prince and his mother both predeceased the Sultan. (2) Aba Khan whose mother was Rani Pirai. He was poisoned by his father's order because he had gone to some one's house who found him there and thrashed him. (3) Ahmad Khan who was nick named Khudawand Khan as Ahmad Shah as Khudawand Khan had conspired to place him on the throne as had already been mentioned. His mother's name is not mentioned. The fourth son was Khahl Khan.

There is some difference as to the place where the merchants complained to the Sultan. Both the Tabaqat and Firishtah say that they came to Muhammadabad and made their complaint there. In the Mirat-i Sikandari Bayley page 216 it is said he then went to Ahmadabad. A party of merchants came to him complaining etc from which one would infer that the complaint was made at Ahmadabad. The Cambridge History of India (p 310) says that the complaint was made when he was hunting at Halol near Champaner.

³ He is called رای طبعه آنر in the lith ed of Firishtah and the number of horses is said to be four hundred there. Col Briggs says that the name and the country of the chief is omitted in the original and he does not give the number of the horses. The Mirat-i Sikandari says that the merchants complained that they were bringing four hundred Persian and Turki horses from Irak and Khurasan and some rolls of Hindustani fabrics. But on reaching the foot of mount Abu the Rajah of Sirohi had seized them all (Bayley pp 216-17). The

The Rāja of the hill of Ābū had taken them all by force and had looted the whole caravan (The Sultān) on hearing their words immediately ordered that the price of the horses might be paid to the merchants from the treasury, and having conferred robes of honour on them commenced to muster his troops and after some days advanced to devastate that country. He sent a *farmān* addressed to the Rāja of Ābū, by the hands of the merchants in advance of himself. The purport of the *farmān* was this that as the merchants were bringing the horses and other merchandise for the Sultān, and he (the Rāja) had taken them with violence, he should at once give back to the merchants exactly what he had taken from them otherwise he should be prepared to meet the anger and wrath of the Sultān. When the merchants took the *farmān* the Rāja of Ābū in great alarm, made over to them three hundred and seventy horses, which he had in their original condition, and gave them the price of thirty-three horses, which had become disabled and also sent a heavy tribute (to the Sultān) by their hand. ¹ The merchants came and waited on the Sultān, informed him of the true state of things, and also placed the tribute of the Rāja before him, upon which he turned back and came to Muhammadābād Chāmpānū.

In the year ² 896 A H (1491 A D) news came that Bahādur Gilānī, servant (گمشده) of Khwājah Mahmūd Gilānī, had turned his head from the obedience due to his master Sultān Mahmūd ³ Lashkarī.

Cambridge History of India (p. 310) makes the number of horses four hundred and three and the name of the chief who had seized them, the Rāja of Ābū.

¹ Firishtah says that the Rāja sent an ambassador with the merchants, and placed himself in the band of the Sultān's servants. The Cambridge History of India (p. 310) says that the Sultān "permitted the merchants to retain the horses, as well as their price." I have not seen this anywhere else and it does not appear reasonable, that the merchants who had come from great distance to sell the horses, should have them returned to them.

² Firishtah lith. ed. gives 900 A H, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 71) gives 900 A H, 1494 A D as the year.

³ The MSS. have محمد but the lith. ed. has لشکری. Sultān Muhammad Lashkarī had, however, died some time before this, and his son Sultān Mahmūd was the nominal ruler, though much of the power was in the hands of Qāsim Barīd. It appears from other histories that Sultān Mahmūd was in command of the troops that were sent against Bahādur Gilānī. I have therefore substituted Sultān Mahmūd for Sultān Muhammad Lashkarī.

the ruler of the Deccan and having taken unlawful and forcible possession of the part of Dabul was causing harassment to ships passing over the sea and the passage of coming to and going from Gujrat had become closed and he had also forcibly carried away the Sultan's own ships. Immediately on hearing this news the Sultan mustered his troops and sent an army under Malik Qiwam ul mulk by land route and he also despatched many ships. When this news reached Sultan Mahmud Bahmani he summoned the *amirs* and said: On several occasions help has come to us from his ancestors and the greatness and grandeur of Sultan Mahmud is known to all and the consideration of the rights of this great dynasty is obligatory and incumbent on our spirit and energy. It is therefore right and proper that we should turn our attention to his (Bahadur Gilani's) destruction. The *amirs* and *ta'irs* applauded the opinion and acknowledged the truth of the statement and began to collect troops. (At the same time) a letter couched in terms of sincerity was sent to Sultan Mahmud and preparations were made for the punishment of Bahadur Gilani and of teaching him a lesson. At the moment which the astrologers declared to be auspicious to Sultan Mahmud he marched from the city of Bidar to affect the destruction of Bahadur and after fighting slew him. The particulars of this occurrence have been narrated in the section about the Deccan.

In the year 897 A H (1474 A D) Sultan Mahmud marched towards the Mahrāsa and on the day spies reported to him that Alif Khan son of Ulugh Khan had fled as he had spent stipends (due to his retainers) for his own purposes and was afraid that they might apply to the Sultan for redress and indignities might be inflicted on him.¹ The Sultan sent Sharf al Jahān to reassure him and although

¹ Firishṭah and Col Briggs say that Alif Khan revolted in 904 A H 1498 A D and their account is briefer than and somewhat different from that in the *Tabaqat*. In the *Mirāt al Shikandari* Bayley page 20 the Sultan is said to have marched to Morasah on a count of Alaf Khan's rebellion. In a note Bayley gives the version in the *Tabakat*. The account given in the *Cambridge History of India* page 311 differs from the others. The year of the revolt is said there to be 1497 and the name of the rebel is Baha ud din Ulugh Khan son of Ulugh Khan Suhrab. He is said to have fled because the people rose against him on account of his oppressing them and of appropriating the pay of the troops.

the emissary preached sermons and advices to him, they had no effect whatever

He sent some elephants, which he had with him in charge of Sharf-i-Jahān, and entered the country of Mandū, but as his father had acted towards Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn gave him no place in his dominions and showed no favour to him at all Alf Khān in distress and at a loss what to do came towards Sultānpūr Sultān Mahmūd sent ¹ Qādī Pī Ishāq to reinforce ² Malik Shaikhā When Qādī Pī Ishāq arrived in the vicinity of ³ Sultānpūr, Alf Khān fought with him, and son of the Qādī Malik-ul-Mashāikh and some other men were slain in the skirmish in the end After much wandering Alf Khān sent a petition to the Sultān, containing an account of his great suffering and distress and praying for the pardon of his offences ⁴ As he was a *Lhānahzād* (one brought up in the family, a hereditary servant) of the Sultān the latter drew the pen of forgiveness over his offences He came and waited on the Sultān in the year 901 A H, had the honour of rendering homage, and had favours and kindness bestowed on him But as the star of his fortune was on the decline, after three months he murdered his *nāib-i-'ard* (officer in-charge of petitions) without any cause, and was put into prison, and died in prison

The name of his father according to the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* was 'Alā ud dīn bin Suhrāb

¹ Firishtah's account is entirely different According to him Qādī Bīr was sent against the rebel and pursued him through hills and jungles, till he at last fled by way of Sultānpūr to Mālwa Col Briggs (vol IV, p 72) says that, "Sheikh Burra Deccany the Kazy ool-Koozat of Ahmudabad" was sent in pursuit of him The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* says that Alaf Khan fled from place to place, and at last went to Sultān Ghīās-ud-dīn Khālji The account in the Cambridge History of India agrees generally with that in the text, but it does not say that Alf Khān fought with the force under the Qādī On the other hand, it says that when the relieving force arrived, he fled into Baglāna

² This is apparently the Qādī mentioned by Firishtah

³ He appears to have been the governor of Sultānpūr He does not appear to be mentioned by Firishtah or in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* The Cambridge History of India, page 311, calls him 'Aziz ul-Mulk Shaikhān

⁴ The latter part of his history is narrated very briefly by Firishtah and the other historians

As ¹ Ādil Khān Faruqī governor of Asir had not for a long time remitted the tribute which had been fixed and was walking in the path of pride and haughtiness the Sultān collected his troop and in the year 906 A H (1149 A D) advanced to punish him and teach him a lesson. When he arrived on the bank of the river Tapti Ādil Khān sent a large tribute and prayed to be excused. Sultān generously accepted his excuses returned to Muhammadābād Champānīr.

In the course of the same year i.e. 906 A H (1499 or 1500 A D) news came that Sultān Naṣir ud dīn Abd ul Qadir having acted with ingratitude had taken the kingdom from Sultān Ghiyāth ud dīn and assumed the title of Sultān. Sultān Mahmud wanted to advance to Malwa to punish him and teach him a lesson. At this time a subsidy came from Sultān Naṣir ud dīn with a petition expressive of his humility and submission. He also stated in the petition that whatever he had done had been done with the consent of his lord master and father but as Shuja Khān and Rānī Khurshīd had ac-

¹ Firishṭah says that Q. Il Bīr with some other chiefs first invaded Lāhōr in 905 A H. Ādil Lāhōrī was unable to meet them and asked Imād ul mulk the ruler of Berār for help but as he received none he sent the tribute which was in arrears and asked for pardon. Firishṭah adds that according to some historians Sultān Mahmud himself advanced as far as the bank of the Tāpti when Ādil Lāhōrī sent the tribute. Col Briggs in a note in vol IV page 73 calls the demand of tribute by the King of Guzerāt from Ādil Khān an unimaginably violent exercise of power but as Bayley has pointed out in a note on page 1 the Lāhōrī rulers were more or less in a kind of feudal loyalty to the Gujarātī Kings. The Cambridge History of India (p. 313) describe Ādil Khān II as one of the most energetic and most powerful rulers of Khūdeh and he had scorned to pay tribute in his career of victory yet a mere demonstration of force by Sultān Mahmud was enough to bring him to his senses.

This sentence requires explanation. Naṣir ud dīn was the son of Sultān Ghiyāth ud dīn of Malwa. He was suspected of having poisoned his father. I have not been able to find any reference to this in Firishṭah or in Col Briggs but Firishṭah says in one place that he was accused of it but he stoutly denied it. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley p. 991) says that Naṣir ud dīn poisoned his father and seized the kingdom. Bayley says in a note that there is no positive evidence of the poisoning. The Farikh-i-Alfi though hostile in tone merely says that there was a suspicion. The Cambridge History of India (p. 311) says Ghiyāth ud dīn was deposed on November 10th 1500 and died in February 1501 not without suspicion of poison.

quined influence over (the mind of) Sultān Gḥiyāth-ūd-dīn, they exerted themselves in concealing the facts. The Sultān having taken pity on his humility and distress, gave up the intention of marching there.

¹ In the same year, as the *Fīrangīs* (apparently the Portuguese) created disturbances in Musalmān ports the Sultān proceeded to the port of Mahām, and when he arrived in the neighbourhood of ² Dūn news was brought to him, that Āyāz one of his slaves had prepared some of the Sultān's ships, and ten of the Turkish ships at the port of Dīp and had fought with the *Fīrangīs* of the port of ³ Chaul. In the action many *Fīrangīs* and four hundred Turks were slain. The *Fīrangīs* fled and ⁴ one of their large ships, the cargo in which was valued at one *kīṭī*, having had its mast struck and broken off by a cannon ball was sunk. Sultān Mahmūd after carrying out the rites of offering thanks to God, returned to Muhammadābād Chāmpānūr.

In the year 914 A.H. ⁵ 'Ādil Khān, son of Hasan Khān, made a representation to Sultān Mahmūd, through his mother, who was the

¹ Firishtah's account is somewhat different. He says that the *Fīrangīs* wanted to build forts on the coast. The Sultān of Rūm, who was their enemy had, on hearing this, sent many ships to carry on a war of religion, and to prevent their carrying out their objects. Some of these ships had arrived in the Gujrāt ports. Sultān Mahmūd also intending to carry on religious war there, started towards the ports of Disī and Daman and Mahām, and when he arrived at Daman he sent his special slave Āyāz Sultānī, who was the Amīr ul-umrā and Satarsāl from the port of Dīp. Col Briggs's account (vol IV, p. 74) is similar but he says that the Turkish fleet was under "Ameer Hoossein" whom the Portuguese called Meer Hashim. The account given in the Cambridge History of India page 312, is long and comprehensive, but it is unnecessary to refer to it here in detail.

² See note 1, page 246.

³ The name is written in Persian as چؤل, but is written in English as Choul or Chaul.

⁴ This was their flag-ship, and probably had on board Don Laurence, the son of Vasco da Gama, who was killed.

⁵ He is called عادل خان in both MSS and in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* and by Firishtah and Col Briggs and also in the *Muntakhab-al-labāb*, vol III page 155, but is called 'Ālam Khān in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* and in the Cambridge History of India. He is called 'Ādil Khān bin Hasan Khān, but whether he was the son of Hasan Khān, or he was the great grandson of Hasan Khān, as stated in the Cambridge History of India in respect of 'Ālam Khān, is not

Sultan's daughter that Adil Khan the son of Mubarak Khan the ruler of Asir and Burhanpur had died seven years and some months ago leaving no son and he hoped that the Sultan would bestow the place of his ancestors on the *faqir* (i.e. himself). The Sultan accepted the request and prayer of his daughter and collected an army in the month of Rajab of that year. In Sha'ban he marched towards Asir and Burhanpur and having passed Ramadan on the bank of the Nerbada in the village of ¹Sili he marched towards Nadarbar in Shawwal. When he arrived at that place he learnt that Malik Husam ud din Maghul who was in possession of half the country of Asir and Burhanpur had in concert with Nizam ul mulk Bahri the ruler of Kawi placed ²Khanzada Alam Khan who was a

clear Adil Khan was probably the son of Qasim Khan I in 1411. He was the younger son of Malik Raja of Kaniya who died in 1399. He was deprived of his share of the patrimony by his elder brother Nasir Khan in 1411 and took up his residence in Gujrat where his descendant intermarried with the royal family.

¹ It is written as سلی in the MSS and printed as سلی in the lithic of the Tabaqat and also in the lithic of Firhtah. It does not appear to be mentioned in any history.

Malik Husam ul din Maghul is called Malik Husam ud din in the lithic of Firhtah and Husam ul Deen of Kandershi by Col. Brigg (vol. IV p. 76). He is called Husam ud din Moghul by Bayley (p. 3) and Malik Husam th Maghul in the Cambridge History of India (p. 314).

² Firishtah says ملک حسام الدین مغل راجه عالم خانرا. It is not clear whether the word Mughal is part of the name of Husam ul din or whether as is more likely Mughalzada a description of Alam Khan. In any case this does not explain the exact connection of Alam Khan to the family. According to a note by Bayley Khanzadla may signify that though he was not a prince he might have belonged to a collateral branch of the family of Asir. It appears also from the Mirat-i-Sikandar by Bayley page 3 that Husam ul din had previously written to Alam (Adil) Khan that if he could join him he could raise him on the throne of his ancestors. Finding later that Sultan Mahmud was also interested in him he retracted his promise and with the help of Nizam ul mulk Bahri placed the other Alam Khan on the throne.

The Cambridge History of India page 313 says that Sultan Mahmud induced Adil Khan II to nominate his youthful kinsman as his heir to the exclusion of his brother Daud but in 1401 A.D. Mahmud was not in a position to press his grandson's claim and Daud succeeded Adil Khan II without any opposition. Daud died in August 1408 A.D. He was succeeded by his son

descendant of the rulers of Asīr and Burhānpūr on the throne of that kingdom, and Malīk Lādan Khālji, who was in possession of (the other) half of the country of Asīr had taken up an attitude hostile to Malīk Hisām-ud-dīn Maghūl, and had taken up a fortified position on the hill of Asīr. Sultān Mahmūd, on hearing of these happenings, advanced to ¹Thālnīr. Malīk ‘Ālam Shah, the *thānadār* of Thālnīr, came and waited upon him, through the intervention of ‘Azīz-ul-mulk Sultānī, *thānadār* of Sultānpūr, and evacuating his *thāna*, ²surrendered it to the Sultān.

On hearing this news, Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī left four thousand horsemen with ‘Ālam Khān and Malīk Hisām-ud-dīn and himself went to Kāwīl. As Sultān Mahmūd felt slightly indisposed in Thālnīr, he remained there for some time, and sent Asaf Khān, and Malīk ‘Azīz-ul-mulk, with a well-equipped army to punish Malīk Hisām-ud-dīn and ‘Ālam Khān. When these officers advanced towards Burhānpūr, the troops left behind by Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī turned their faces to their own country, without (obtaining) the permission of Hisām-ud-dīn. Malīk Lādan Khālji came forward to welcome Asaf Khān, and had an interview with him. Asaf Khān took him with himself to wait upon the Sultān. Malīk Hisām-ud-dīn also, ashamed and repentant, came and joined the Sultān’s camp, and both were honoured with kindness and favour. After the ‘*Īd-ud-duha*, at an auspicious moment, the Sultān conferred the title of A‘zam Humāyūn on ‘Ādil Khān, and bestowed on him four elephants and ³thirty *lakhs* of *tankas* as a contribution towards his expenses, and entrusted to him the reins of the government and defence of Asīr and Burhānpūr. He conferred the title of Khān Jahān on Malīk Lādan, and gave him permission to go back with A‘zam Humāyūn. ‘Ādil Khān. As

Ghaznī Khān, who was poisoned after a reign of ten days. Ahmad Nizām Shāh now invaded Khāndesh with the object of placing another scion of the Fārūqī house, also named ‘Ālam Khān, who had taken refuge in his court.

¹ بهاسر in the text edition

² This incident does not appear to be mentioned anywhere else

³ It is لک سی thirty *lakhs* in the MSS, and in the lith. ed. Firishtah, however, on page 204 of the lith. ed. (vol. II) has سه three *lakhs*. Col. Briggs has not mentioned the various gifts. The *Mirāt-ı Sikandari*, Bayley, page 225, has thirteen *lakhs*. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the gifts.

Malik Lidan had been born in the village of ¹ Binas that *moudah* was granted to him as a reward. The Sultan also conferred the title of *Chazi Khan* on Malik Muhammad Bakha son of Imad ul mulk Asiri and that of Qutb Khan on Malik Alam Shah *thanadar* of Thalpur that of Muhafiz Khan on Malik Hafiz and that of Saif Khan on his brother Malik Yusuf and sent them back in attendance on Azam Humayun. ² He left Malik Nasrat ul mulk and Mujahid ul mulk Gujrati in the service of Azam Humayun after giving them money to defray their expenses. On the 17th Dhi hujjah he marched from that station and proceeded towards Sultanpur Nadarbar. At the first station (in the march) he conferred the title of Shahrvar on Malik Hisam ud din Maghul and having bestowed the *moudah* of ⁴ Dhanura which is one of the dependencies of Sultanpur and two elephants gave him permission to go back. He himself then by successive marches arrived at Muhammadabad Champaur on the 16th of the sacred month of Muharram in the year 916 A H (1510 A D).

Adil Khan after his arrival at Burhanpur (found that) Malik Hisam ud din Shahrvar Malik Bakha and Chazi Khan had on account

¹ The name is بناس in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in the lith ed of Firishtah but Col Briggs (vol IV p 76) make it the district of Ahwa. The Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 2 has The village of Banas in the paragana Sultanpur. In the text edition بناس is apparently a typographical error.

The name is as I have it in the text in the MSS and in the lith ed but Firishtah lith ed has وملك نالها Malik Nalha son of Imad ul mulk I Khan dhi and the Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 2 has Muhammad Makha.

² The sentence from در خدمت اعظم هماون گراسب to وملك حسام الدين is not to be found in one MS but is in the other and in the lith ed.

⁴ The name is دهنوره in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in the lith ed of Firishtah. It is Dhanurah also in the Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 2 but Col Briggs has (vol IV p 16) the town of Dhoor.

⁵ There are variations in the readings. The MSS have the reading which I have adopted. The reading in the lith ed is different. The other histories do not give the details of the way in which Hisam ud din was murdered. Firishtah merely says سلطان اعظم هماون ملك حسام الدين سهرار را كشته اعوان اورا. And the Cambridge History of India page 314 says one of his (Adil Khan III's) first acts was to cause Malik Husain who was again plotting with the king of Ahmadnagar to be assassinated.

of an ill-feeling which they had with Malik Lādan Khālji Khān Jahān, left Burhānpūr and had taken up their residence in Thāhnūr. After some days, news was brought to Aʿzam Humāyūn, that Malik Hisām-ud-dīn Shahīyār had combined with Nizām-ul-mulk Bahūrī, and wanted to raise the dust of disturbance. Having become cognisant of this treachery on his part, Aʿzam Humāyūn sent a message to summon him. Malik Hisām-ud-dīn knowing the state of things came towards Burhānpūr with four thousand horsemen. When he arrived in the vicinity of the city, Aʿzam Humāyūn went forward to receive him with ¹ three thousand Gujrātī horsemen, took him to his palace, and after conferring on him a robe of honour, gave him permission to go back to his camp. On the following day he arranged with the men in his confidence, that when Malik Hisām-ud-dīn would come to the hall of audience, he should be taken by the hand to the private chamber, and when he would be bidding farewell, Daryā Shāh Gujrātī, who would be carrying the sword of Aʿzam Humāyūn, 'Ādil Khān, should deal him a fatal wound. After he is murdered, his men should also be murdered at the various places (where they happen to be). According to this agreement, a man was sent to summon Hisām-ud-dīn. The latter, in his great pride and conceit, came with all his followers. After they had met, (Aʿzam Humāyūn) in the way of consulting him took him by the hand into the private chamber. They had a short conversation, after which Aʿzam Humāyūn handed him *pān* (betel), and bade him farewell. At this time Malik Hisām-ud-dīn straightened himself up, and ² Daryā Khān struck him on the head with the sword with such force, that it was cloven in two.

When Malik Burhān 'Atā'-ul-lah, who was the *vazīr* of Aʿzam Humāyūn, became aware of what had happened, he ordered a number of Gujrātīs, who were with him, to smite the wretches. When those men drew their swords from the scabbards, Malik Muhammad Bākhā

¹ The number is ٣٠٠٠ thirty hundred or three thousand in both MSS, it is ٣٠٠٠٠٠ thirty hundred thousand, which is of course incorrect, in the lith. ed., Firishtah has ٣٠٠ three hundred, which is more probable and in the Persian text of Muntakhab al labāb, vol. III, page 443, has ٢٠٠ two hundred three hundred.

² The same man is called Daryā Shāh a few lines earlier.

and the other *sardars* who had accompanied Malik Hīsam ud dīn turned their faces in flight. Four hundred Habshīs who were present at the *darbar* cut them all down and Malik Muhammad Bakha and the other leaders were thrown wallowing in the dust and blood. The half of the country which was in his possession came without further dispute into Azam Humayun's possession. When the account of these events in great detail and clearness reached Sultān Mahmud in the month of Rabi' ul awwal of the afore-mentioned year ¹ he declared that whoever did not regard the rights of the salt fell in the end into the place of destruction.

In the year 916 A.H. 1510 A.D. a petition from Azam Humayun reached (Sultān Mahmud) to the effect that he had on one occasion gone to the fort of Asir, and that he had found Sher Khan and Saif Khan who were in charge of it full of mischief and hostility and now that Malik Hīsam ud dīn had been slain these two wretches had combined together in their enmity and malice and they had written a letter to Nizam ul mulk Bahri and had summoned Khanzada Ālam Khan. This slave (i.e. he himself) in concert with Malik Ladan Khan Jahan and Mujahid ul mulk and other *amirs* had advanced to the fort and is besieging it. Nizam ul mulk Bahri has brought Ālam Khan with him and has come with his army and is stationed near the border. It is true if he should enter this slave's territory he would have to raise the siege and would have to go and fight with him. The Sultān bestowed five *lakhs* of *tanakas*

¹ This is also mentioned by Firishtah.

² This also is mentioned by Firishtah but he says that Nizam ul mulk had come to his border bringing with him Ālam Khan and with the Raja of Kulna. It may be mentioned also that he says that the five *lakhs* of *tanaka* were تنگہ سہند or silver *tanakas*. Col Briggs after mentioning Mahmood Shah's return to Sooltanpoor says (vol IV p 76) Notwithstanding these arrangements internal commotions occurred at Aseer during the following year which were amicably adjusted through the agency of Mahmood Shah who sent his own son to carry into effect his orders and to confirm the authority of Adil Khan. This is scarcely correct. The adjustment was anything but amicable so far as Malik Hīsam ud dīn and Malik Muhammad Bakha etc. who accompanied Malik Hīsam ud dīn were concerned and not even so far as Sher Khan and Saif Khan and Khanzada Ālam Khan were concerned. It does not also appear that any son of Sultān Mahmud was sent to Khandesh to settle matters there.

as a contribution to his expenses, and sent Dilāwar Khān, Safdar Khān and other *amīns* to help and reinforce him. He also wrote in reply, "let my (grand)son's mind remain assured, that whenever there should be any necessity, I shall myself go to his aid. How can Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī, who is a slave of one of the Sultāns of the Deccan, have such power that he should cause any damage to the territory of my (grand)son?" The *amīns* mentioned above had not yet marched from outside the city, when ¹ Shāhzāda Muzaffar Khān, an account of whom will before long be narrated, came from the town of Barōda, and having obtained the honour of kissing his father's feet prayed for and obtained a further sum of seven *lakhs* of *tankas* towards A'zam Humāyūn's expenses.

After some days, an emissary of Nizām-ul-mulk Bahrī came and waited on the Sultān and presented a petition (of his master) to the following effect: 'As Alam Khānzāda came as a suppliant to me, I hope that he (the Sultān) will be pleased to bestow a part of the

¹ It appears from the Cambridge History of India, page 314, that A'zam Humāyūn or 'Adil Khān III cemented his alliance with Gujrat by marrying a daughter of Sultān Muzaffar. I have not seen this mentioned anywhere else, except in the Muntakhab al labāb, vol. III, page 445, but it is stated there that Sultān Mahmūd gave a daughter of Sultān Muzaffar in marriage to him at the same time that he conferred the title of A'zam Humāyūn on him, and confirmed him in the government of Khāndēsh. So that it was more the act of Sultān Mahmūd than of A'zam Humāyūn. Besides it was scarcely necessary for A'zam Humāyūn to cement his alliance with Gujrat by marriage. He was the grandson (daughter's son) of Sultān Mahmūd, and was being treated with great affection and kindness by the Sultān himself, and by his son Shāhzāda Muzaffar (who is somewhat loosely and incorrectly called Sultān Muzaffar, while his father was still alive, both in the Cambridge History of India and in the Muntakhab-al-labāb). It appears from Firishtah that the Shāhzāda prayed for the additional grant, not for his son-in-law, but for his nephew (*khwāhazāda*), so that the earlier relation had greater force and validity with Sultān Mahmūd and Shāhzāda Muzaffar than the later one. The Muntakhab-al-labāb, vol. III, page 444, has a somewhat different account. It says Sultān Mahmūd, immediately on becoming acquainted with the purport of the letter, sent twelve *lakhs* of Mahmūdīs, which amount to six lakhs of rupees current at that time, and various articles, such as vessels of gold and silver, etc. The twelve *lakhs* may include the five *lakhs* originally given, and the seven *lakhs* given at the request of Shāhzāda Muzaffar. He also made an assignment of eight *lakhs* of *tankas* out of the revenues (*mahsūl*) of *pargana* Sultānpūr.

country of A ir and Burhanpur on him. The Sultān sent for the emissary and told him: Since ¹he (i.e. Nizam ul mulk) places his foot further than his blanket, he will soon receive his merited punishment. In short, when the *amirs* mentioned above (Dilawar Khan etc.) arrived at the town of Nadarbar, Sher Khan and Saif Khan, being now aware of the disastrous end of their affairs, carried their application to Malik Mujahid ul mulk and prayed for protection. Azam Humayun, finding this to be an unlooked-for boon, gave them promise and engagement. Sher Khan and Saif Khan, relying on his promise, came out of the fort and went away to the territory of Kawi. After the arrival of Dilawar Khan and the other *amirs*,

ʿAdil Khan determined on raiding the country of Kalna. After he had harried a few of the villages and hamlets, the Raja of Kalna sent tribute and prayed for forgiveness ²of his offences. ʿAdil Khan then gave the Cujrat *amirs* leave to go back to their country and returned to Burhanpur.

It was in this year that Sultān Sikandar Lodi, the Badshah of Delhi, sent, as a matter of special friendship, some nice things as presents to the Sultān. Before this, no Badshah of Delhi had sent any presents to any Badshah of Cujrat. It was also in Dhi-hijjah of the year 916 A.H. (1510 A.D.) that Sultān Mahmud travelled towards Nahrwala and made the learned and pious men and the *faqirs* living there happy by granting largesses and favours to them. He told (them) that the object of his coming there was this: that he should ⁴bid adieu to the sainted ones there; perhaps the angel of death would not give him further respite. The learned and great men all offered prayers for him, each in his particular way. He then

¹ The word او is omitted from the MSS. According to Firishtah, the Sultan's word to the emissary were a good deal stronger and more emphatic.

ʿAdil Khan, whom Nizam ul din has been calling Azam Humayun, is here again called by his proper name.

² A sentence which occurs in the lith. ed. at this place but is omitted from both MSS: عالم حال اراں سرور من برحاسب and means and ʿAdil Khan left that country. I have omitted it from the text but in the text edition امرای گجرات عال حال اراں سرور من is retained between عالم حال and گجرات.

⁴ One MS. inserts کرد بعدی after رحصب which appears to be illegible and unintelligible.

mounted and proceeded to circumambulate the tombs of the Shaikhs of Pattan, may the mercy of God be on them all ! On the 4th day, he started on the journey to Ahmadābād and having circumambulated the holy tomb of ¹ Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified ! turned towards Muhammadābād. As at this time he felt very ill and weak, he summoned Shāhzāda Muzaffar Khān from the town of Barōda, and gave him pleasant advice. After four days, when he saw some signs of improvements in his health, he granted leave to the Shāhzāda to return to Barōda. But after a few days the illness increased and he became extremely infirm and weak.

At this time, one day, Farhat-ul-mulk reported to him, that Shāh Ismā'il, the Bādshāh of Irān, had sent Yādgār Bēg Qazlbāsh, with a body of other Qazlbāshes with elegant presents in the way of an embassy. He said ² "May the great God not show me the face of a Qazlbāsh, who is (a follower of) the enemies of the ³ companions of the Prophet of God, may the benediction of God and salutation be on him ! and of the perpetrators of oppression, and as a matter of

¹ This was at Sarkhēj. Firishtah also says that it was the tomb of Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, that he visited here, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 77) makes it the tomb of "Sheikh Ahmud Geesoo Duraz"

² The Cambridge History of India, page 315, says that "Yādgār Beg Qizilbāsh was commissioned to invite Mahmūd to embrace the Shi'ah faith". This may be correct, but I have not seen it stated in any work of a Muhammadan historian. Elphinstone on page 765 of his History of India (edition 1889) says "the reign of Mozaffar opened with a splendid embassy from Shāh Ismā'il king of Persia". This is not strictly correct, the embassy had been sent to Sultān Mahmūd, but it only arrived after his death, and the accession of Sultān Muzaffar. Elphinstone concludes the paragraph by saying that the embassy "was probably designed to conciliate their favour to the Shi'ā religion". If this is the foundation of the statement in the Cambridge History of India, it scarcely justifies the positive assertion that is made there. It also adds somewhat picturesquely that Mahmūd sent a message to "the heretics bidding them begone". This is also not mentioned anywhere as far as I have seen. On the other hand, it is said both in the Tabaqāt and by Firishtah that he expressed a pious wish, that God might not show him the face of a Qazlbāsh and this actually happened for he died before Yādgār Bēg could reach Muhammadābād. It would, in fact, appear that he could not be approaching Muhammadābād, if the Sultān had bade him begone.

³ Firishtah says more precisely اصحاب ثلاثة or the three companions, namely Abū Bakr and 'Umr and 'Uthmān.

fact it happened so He then ordered that Shahzada Muzaffar Khan should be quickly summoned and Yadgar Beg Qizlbash had not yet arrived when at the time of evening prayer on Monday the 2nd of Ramadan in the year 971 A H (23rd November 1511 A D) he bound up the goods of existence (i.e. died)

He lived for ¹ 69 years and 11 days and he reigned for 55 years and one month and 2 days He is described in *farmans* (*manashir*) as Khudaigan Halim (the patient or calm Lord) He is also called Mahmud Begarah and Begarah means a cow whose horns turn upwards and then curl round His moustaches were of this shape and on this account he has been named ² Begarah He was ³ a Badshah calm or patient merciful brave liberal and God fearing

¹ Firishtah makes it sixty nine years and eleven months

The word is written as Bégra or Bé Gurra by Col Briggs (vol IV p 71) Begurra by the translator of Ras Mala Begara by Elphinstone Begara by Bayley and Begarha in the Cambridge History of India but it is سكره in the MSS of the Tabaqat and in the lith ed of Firishtah and سكره in the lith ed of the Tabaqat and in the Persian ed of the Muntakhab al labab M Hidayat Ho a n has adopted سكره in the text edition So that it was always written with a G in English and with a K in Persian I do not know sufficient Gujarati to say which is correct

² Firishtah gives another etymology of the word on the authority of Shah Jamal ud din Anju who says that as he captured two renowned forts he was called سكره and Firishtah adds that this is nearer the correct etymology Ras Mala vol I page 39 says be means two and girah means a fort If this etymology be correct then the correct Persian spelling would be سكره and the correct English spelling would be Begarah The meaning of the two curled cow horns may if I may venture a guess be correct if the word is changed to سكره Beorah (be meaning two and girah meaning a knot or curl)

³ The Cambridge History of India page 315 says that he had made himself immune from the effects of poisons by gradually absorbing poisons into his system and quotes Hudibras Part II Canto I where it is said that

The prince of Cambay's daily food
Is asp and basilisk and toad

He goes on to say that his voracious appetite demanded large supplies of more wholesome food His daily allowance was between twenty and thirty pounds weight and before going to sleep he placed two pounds or more of boiled rice on either side of his couch so that he might find something to eat on which ever side he awoke I was at first inclined to think that the author of the

~ AN ACCOUNT OF ¹SULTĀN MUZAFFAR SHĀH, SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

As on Monday, the 2nd of Ramadān in the year 917 A H, Mahmūd Shāh son of Muhammad Shāh passed away from the narrowness of bodily existence to the wide spaces of the spiritual world, Shāhzāda Muzaffar Khān arrived after two hours (*sā'at*) of the night of Tuesday the 3rd of Ramadān (had passed), and by the exertions of the *amīns* and the men learned in divine knowledge, sat on the throne of sovereignty. The people performed the ceremony of the offering of service and of wave offerings. On the same night, he sent the body of his father to the tomb, which is the resting place of light, of the chief of Shaikhhs, Shaikh Ahmad Khattū, may his soul be sanctified ¹. He made over two *lakhs* of *tanhas* to 'Azīz-ul-mulk so that he might distribute it, among deserving people in the town of ²Sarkēj. He bestowed robes of honour on the *amīns*, and the great men of the kingdom, and honoured some of them with suitable titles. On the same day, *khutba* was read in his name on the pulpits of Islām. Among his *khāsa khāil* (men of his own household), he conferred the title of

Cambridge History of India had either made a mistake or had exaggerated what he had found in some Persian history, but I find that he has if anything greatly diminished the quantity of Sultān Mahmūd's food. According to the author of "The coins of the Gujrat Saltanat" published in the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol XXI, page 290, his daily allowance was one Gujrātī *man* in weight, i.e., forty-one pounds. His little breakfast consisted of 150 plantains, a cup of honey and another of butter, but it is not stated whether this was included in the one Gujrātī *man*, or was in addition to it. The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 162, also gives him a similar quantity.

I find that the fact of his having made himself immune from the effect of poisons is based on the account of two European travellers, Bartema, as Elphinstone calls him (or more correctly Di Verthema) and Barbosa, mentioned by Elphinstone on page 764 of his History of India, 7th edition. I should be inclined to doubt the statement about the quantity of food. It is curious that the European travellers say nothing about it, and the Indian historians are equally silent about his being able to absorb abnormal quantities of poisons. I am inclined to agree with Mr Danes, the editor of the book of Barbosa for the Hakluyt Society, page 122, that probably out of the stories about the enormous quantities of food eaten by him, arose the stories about the abnormal things he ate.

¹ The lith. ed. has *سالمان مطهر* before *شاه*, but both MSS omit it.

² *سر کیم* in the text edition.

Imad ul mulk on Malik Khush Qadam and of Khudwand Khan on Malik Rashid ul mull and placed the reins of the *ta arat* in the latter's powerful hands

In the month of Shawwal of the afore mentioned year Yadgar Beg Qazlbash the ambassador of Shah Isma'il arrived from Iraq to the neighbourhood of Muhammadabad. The Sultan sent all the *amirs* and *ta'irs* to welcome him and met him on his arrival with pleasure and gratitude. Yadgar Beg placed the beautiful presents which he had brought for Mahmud Shah at the service of Muzaffar Shah. The latter conferred kingly robes on Yadgar Beg and all the Qazlbashes and elected a special mansion for their residence.

After some days he went from Muhammadabad to the town of Baroda and he gave the name of Daulatabad to that town. At this time news came that Shah Khan son of Sultan Nasir ud din Khalji who had revolted with the help of Khwajah Jahan the eunuch of Sultan Mahmud and had seized Mandu and assumed the title of ³ Sultan Muhammad and had made most of the nobles take his side as the pen has attempted to narrate these events in the section about Malwa now fled from Mandu and came praying for help. Sultan Muzaffar sent Muhafiz Khan to receive and welcome Shah Khan so that he

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have بلعى but the other MS. has بلاعى. It appears that the embassy from the Shah of Persia in respect of which Sultan Mahmud had expressed a pious wish that he might not have to show his face to them and whom in the forcible language of the Cambridge History of India he ordered to be begone was received with much favour by Sultan Muzaffar. Firsihtah goes a little further than Nizamuddin. He says ودر سراط معظم و بكرم دفته فروگذاست. i.e. in the observation of respect and honour no minutia was omitted.

There is some slight difference in the readings here both MSS. read حواجة سراير سلطان محمود but the lith. ed. has حواجة سراي سلطان محمود. I have adopted the former reading. The sentence requires some explanation. Shah Khan was the elder brother of Sultan Nasir ul din but the latter deposed him and became the Sultan and took the title of Sultan Mahmud (II). Afterwards Shah Khan rebelled against him and having seized Mandu assumed the title of Sultan Muhammad but on being defeated afterwards came to Sultan Muzaffar for help.

³ The correct title Sultan Muhammad is given in one MS. but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultan Mahmud.

might carry out the rites of hospitality and try to please his heart. After an interview (Sultān Muzaflar) remained for some days at Barōda in order to entertain Sāhib Khān and then went away to Muhammad-ābād. He sent Qaisar Khān to the town of Dahūd, that he might report a correct and detailed account of Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, and of the condition of the country of Mālwa and of the behaviour of the *amīns*. As the rains (now) commenced, the people halted at the various places where they happened to be. Sāhib Khān sent a message one day to the effect that a long time ¹ had elapsed since the coming of the *faqīr*, but he does not see that there has been any progress in his affairs. The Sultān replied, "If the great God so wills, I shall at the end of the rains, either amicably or by force recover half the kingdom of Mālwa from the possession of Sultān Mahmūd and shall make it over to you." But as the star of the fortune of Sāhib Khān was on the decline, it so happened, that he became friendly with Yādgār Bēg Qazlbāsh, who had become known to the people of Gujrāt by the name of *Sulḥ kulāh*, i.e., red cap, owing to their living near each other. ² One day there was a quarrel between the servants (of the

¹ One MS. has *سدة* instead of *فقير* in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in *Firishtah* about Sāhib Khān's complaint about Qaisar Khān having done nothing to carry out the work which he had been deputed to perform, the Cambridge History of India, page 316, says, that Qaisar Khān returned with a report favourable to Sāhib Khān's claim. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, page 245, gives a somewhat different account of the work which Qaisar Khān was to do, but it says nothing about his return, or his submitting any report.

² This incident is variously stated in the different histories. *Firishtah's* account is similar to that in the text, but he adds that the Qazlbāshes wounded some of Sāhib Khān's men. Col Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 80, 81) says that the Qazlbāshes wounded several persons wholly unconnected with the affair. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, pages 245, 246, begins with the altercation between the servants, but goes on to say that there was some trouble between Sāhib Khān, who is called Shāhzāda Muḥamad, and the Persian envoy, who is called quite incorrectly *Mirza Ibrāhīm*. Sāhib Khān went in the evening to some old servant of his who lived in the same *sear* as the Persian envoy. Some strife monger told the latter that Sāhib Khān wanted to rob him, and he shut the door of the *sear*, and afterwards took Sāhib Khān to his own apartment. In the morning Sāhib Khān escaped, and spread a report that an order had been issued to plunder the Qazlbāshes. A great crowd collected and a fight took place. Many

two households) and it ended in a fight and the house of Yādgar Beg was looted. A report spread among the Gujrat soldiers that the Turkmans had seized Sahib Khan. The latter being ashamed at such a report left without taking leave of Sultān Muzaffar. The details of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section about Malwa.

As after the departure of Sahib Khan news came to Sultān Muzaffar about the power and violence of the ¹ Pajputs and of the weakness of Sultān Mahmud Khalji his high spirit induced him to undertake the punishment of the former. In order to carry out this resolution he went to Ahmadabad so that he might be sure of the safety of the *thanas* of his own dominions and he might advance into Malwa

of the *Kazilbashe* were slain and the house was set on fire and plundered. Afterwards Sultān Muzaffar paid *15 lakhs* of *tanlahs* to the envoy and sent him back to Irq with many presents. The Sultan was annoyed with Sahib Khan and he having received intimations from some *amirs* of repute in Malwa went away without taking leave of the Sultan. The Cambridge History of India page 317 has an entirely different story. It says that before Sultān Muzaffar could redeem his promise to help him Sahib Khan left Gujarat owing to the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador who invited him to dinner and assaulted him. The prince's servants attacked the ambassador's suite and plundered his lodging but the affair was noised about and Sahib Khan was overcome with shame that he fled from Gujarat. I do not know what the authority for this version is but the fact that the Persian ambassador was paid a large sum by Sultān Muzaffar as compensation and was sent off with presents and all marks of honour and Sahib Khan was overcome with shame and fled from Gujrat shows that the statement about the gross misconduct of the Persian ambassador is very improbable.

¹ They are called Poorby Rajpoots by Col Briggs (vol IV p 81). According to the *Mirat-i Sikandari* Bayley page 47 they were an army of Hindu collected at the instance of Sultān Mahmud himself who gave their leader the title of Medini Rao. According to a note by Bayley in the same page he must have been a man of very remarkable and in many respects of a very noble and generous character. According to *Ris Mala* vol I page 381

Mednee Raee the Hindoo minister of that prince had it was represented acquired such authority that nothing but the name of king was left to the sultan and infelicitously and therefore rapidly regaining its dominion. The Cambridge History of India page 31 does not mention Medni Ray but says that Viruldin of Malwa had employed in his army a large number of Pajputs from eastern Hinduistan who had become so powerful in the kingdom that Mahmud II was a puppet in their hands.

after asking for the help of the great ones there, both dead and living. He remained in Ahmadābād for a week, and then proceeded to Kōdhrāh (Gōdhrāh). He halted there for some days to collect his troops. In the course of these days news was brought to him, that Malik 'Am-ul-mulk, the governor of Pattan, was coming with his retainers to wait on him, i.e., the Sultān, but on the way he received information that the Rāja of Īdar, taking advantage of such an opportunity, had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion in that locality, and had raided the country as far as the borders of the Sābarmatī. Malik 'Am-ul-mulk, therefore, on account of his loyalty and devotion wanted that he should come, and attend on the Sultān after punishing him. He had therefore gone, and attacked the town of Mahiāsa. But in the meantime, the Rāja of Īdar, having collected a large force, came forward to meet him, and a great battle took place between the two armies. As Malik 'Abd-ul-mulk with two hundred men attained to martyrdom, and an elephant which he had with him was cut to pieces, 'Am-ul-mulk being unable to stand firm fled.

On hearing this news Sultān Muzaffar advanced towards Īdar, and when he arrived at the town of Mahiāsa, he sent an army to plunder and devastate the country. The Rāja evacuated the fort, and concealed himself in the hills ² of Bijānagar. When the Sultān arrived at Īdar, there were only ten Rājput̃s who stood there deliberately, with the intention of immolating themselves and were ³ barbarously and cruelly slain. They left no vestige of any building.

¹ His name according to Firishtah was Bhīm Rāy. He also describes 'Abu ul mulk as a *sardār*, and Col Briggs calls him an officer of distinction. According to the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 249. Abd ul Mulk was the brother of 'Am ul Mulk. Bayley says, in a note on page 249, that according to the *Tabakāt*, 'Am ul Mulk lost forty men. This is not correct according to the MSS or the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* or the lith ed of *Firishtah* or Col Briggs, according to all of whom 200 men were slain. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 317, agrees with the text.

² So called in both MSS and in lith ed and also in the lith ed of *Firishtah*, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 81) has "Beesalnuggui". The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* and the *Cambridge History of India* and *Rās Mālā* all say went to the hills or hill country.

³ The words are *مہلت و حواری کستہ شدید*. I am not quite sure that my translation is quite correct. It sounds rather offensive.

or temple or garden or trees. The Raja came forward with great humility and sending ¹ Malik Kobi Zunnardar (Brahman) to wait on the Sultan and prayed for pardon. He sent a messenger to the effect that Malik Ain ul mulk owing to the great enmity which he had against this slave had come and plundered his country and owing to his distress this helpless one had committed certain acts. If he has committed any offence he was deserving of the anger and wrath of the Sultan. He was sending twenty *lakhs* of *tankas* and a hundred horses by the hand of the *takils*. As the conquest of Malwa was in the forefront of the Sultan's spirit he accepted the Raja's excuses and returned to Kodhrah. He bestowed the twenty *lakhs* of *tankas* and the hundred horses on Ain ul mulk so that he might equip his men.

He sent Shahzada Sikandar Khan from Kodhrah to act as the governor of Muhammadabad. When he arrived in the town of Dahud he ordered Qusar Khan that he should take possession of the country as far as the village of ² Devla which was in the possession of Sultan

¹ The name is Kobi in both MSS. and Malik Kobi in the lith ed. It is Malik Kobi in the lith ed. of Firhtah and Muhammad Kobi in Col. Briggs (vol IV p 8). The Mirat-i Sikandarī Bayley page 49 has Malik Kobi a Brahman and a minister of the Sultan in the text and this is corroborated by Bayley who says in a note that he was really a minister of Muzaffar Khan and he will be found often mentioned in the sequel. He is not mentioned at all in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Hoain has علی کوبہ in the text edition.

It is twenty *lakh* and eight *lakh* of *tankas* respectively in the two MSS. and eight lakhs of rupees in the lith ed. Firhtah lith ed. has twenty *lakh* of *tanka* which is equal to two thousand and three hundred. The Mirat-i Sikandarī does not give the amount but Bayley says in a note that the Turkish Alf says that it is a twenty *lakh* of *tankas* (equivalent to two thousand and three hundred). Col. Briggs (vol IV p 8) has two hundred thousand and three hundred. The Cambridge History of India (p 317) has eight hundred thousand rupees.

² The place is دیوالہ in the MSS. and in the lith ed. of Firhtah. In the lith ed. of the Tabaqat it is دیوالہ Dilwala. Col. Briggs has the town of Dyala. The Mirat-i Sikandarī Bayley page 50 has the place of Diolah which is very difficult. The Cambridge History of India page 317 has Deoli near the Muhl and in a note in vol. North and 74 is East. The Cambridge History of India goes on to say that the Sultan had now changed his intention of aiding Mahmud by crushing the Rajputs and had formed

Mahmūd Khaljī s men After that he advanced towards Dhārāgarh On the way the ¹ son of Harkhūkhā, who was a resident of Dhār, came and waited on the Sultān, and begged for quarter for the people of the city The Sultān gave him assurances of safety, and sent Qawām-ul-mulk (son of Qawām-ul-mulk) and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, son of ‘Imād-ul-mulk, in advance of himself, to reassure and encourage the citizens of Dhār At this time intelligence came that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī ² had been left alone, and the *amīrs* of Chandēri had risen against him and he had gone towards that place Sultān Muzaffar summoned back his *amīrs*, and told them, “My object in undertaking this expedition was really that I should drive away the *Pūabīa Kāfis*, and divide the kingdom equally between Sultān Mahmūd and Sāhib Khān, the sons of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn Now that Sultān Mahmūd has gone to put down the *amīrs* of Chandēri, and has taken away the tyrannical Rājpūts with him, it would be removed from the rules of humanity, and the customs of brave men, to enter his country”

Qawām-ul-mulk, who had now joined the Sultān, reported to the latter something of the ³ beauties of the deer-park of Dhār, and made him desirous and anxious to see the place, and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase Sultān Muzaffar left Qawām-ul-mulk, to guard the

the design of conquering and annexing Mālwa I have nowhere found any evidence of such a change of mind All his acts culminating in the restoration of Mandū to Sultān Mahmūd, after it had been recovered from the Rājpūts in 924 A H (1518 A D), show that there was no such change It is true that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had great fear about Sultān Muzaffar’s intentions, but Mandū was restored to him, and Sultān Muzaffar returned to Gujrāt

¹ Firishtah says چون مردم دغار باسقتال امدہ امان خواستند, and does not name anyone as the spokesman of the people of Dhār The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 250, says the son of the head man of Dhār came

² The words in the MSS and in the lith ed are مکورد در ماددہ the meaning of which is not clear There are no similar words in Firishtah, who says that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had gone to crush the *amīrs* of Chandēri, who had risen against him The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 250, also says that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī and Mēdinī Rāō had gone towards Chāndēri

³ The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* Bayley, page 251, says “gave such a glowing description of the buildings of the deer-park, which had been formed there under the order of Sultān Ghīās ud dīn”, etc

camp and with ¹ two thousand horsemen and one hundred and fifty elephants proceeded to Dhar. When he arrived there he mounted the same afternoon to go on a pilgrimage to the tombs of Shaikh Abd ul lah Janā'il and Shaikh Kamal ud din Malwā. It is said that in the time of Raja Bhoj Shaikh Abd ul lah had the name of *Pandey Brij* and was his *ta'ir* and because of inclination having accepted Islam attained to spiritual greatness by pious exertions and exercises. In short the Sultan having in the neighbourhood of Dhar given leave to Nizam ul mulk so that he might hunt in the neighbourhood of Dilawara Nizam ul mulk passed through Dilawara and went to Nalcha and when he was returning a ² body of *Purabia* Rajputs came on and obstructed him and they obtained their deserts as is mentioned in the section about Malwa. Sultan Muza'fir on being apprised of this occurrence was very angry with and reproved Nizam ul mulk for it was his only object that this year he should simply see the country and return and acts like these which had been committed by Nizam ul mulk ³ caused him much thought. The Sultan then turned back and marched towards Gujrat and took up his quarters at Muhammadabad Champunir.

In the month of Shawwal in the year 921 A.H. (1515 A.D.) as after the death of ⁴ Ray Bham Raja of Idar Rana Sanla had come to

¹ It is two thousand in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. and also in the lith. ed. of Firishah and in Col. Briggs (vol. IV. p. 8) but the Mirat-i-Sikandari Bayley page 1 has twelve thousand and light horse.

According to the Mirat-i-Sikandari the Sultan did not give Nizam ul Mulk permission to return but he told him and some others to go and see the deer park. He did not return and the Sultan was informed later on that Nizam ul Mulk had probably gone to Nalcha to see his brother (who apparently was a Hindu and named Rāy Sing) who dwelt there. It appears from the Cambridge History of India page 318 that Nizam ul Mulk was a son of Raja Iatā'il (or Rāy Batā'il of Champunir).

² According to the Mirat-i-Sikandari Bayley page 1 they came from Mandu and pursued him. Nizam ul Mulk faced about and fought. Forty of the infidel were killed and he retreated back to Mandu.

³ The actual words are ناعب مسعولى حائز

⁴ It appears that Rāy Bham was the younger son of Rāy Bham and he had displaced his elder brother. Ray Mal was the son of the latter and having now grown to man's estate claimed the throne. The Cambridge History of India page 318 calls Rai Mal the brother-in-law of Rana Sanla. The

feudatory of Ashtanagar fled from Mandū on account of the violence of the Pūrabīa Rājput̃s and waited on the Sultān and ¹ complained of the great power which they had acquired. ² A few days later, a representation came from the *dārōghā* of Dahūd that Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī had become alarmed at the great power of the Pūrabīa Rājput̃s, and had come praying for help. As he had arrived at the village of Bhakōr which was situated on the boundary of Gujrāt this slave (i.e., he himself) had waited on him, and as far as lay in his power, had left nothing undone in rendering service to him. Sultān Muzaffar was pleased on hearing of these incidents and he sent tents and a red pavilion with necessary equipages and many beautiful gifts and presents and all that is specially reserved for *bādshāhs* by the hand of Qaisar Khān and he himself advanced to welcome Sultān Mahmūd. They met in the village of ³ Dēvla. Sultān Muzaffar did everything to please his guest and exhorted him not to be much distressed owing to the separation from his children and his kingdom as before long

مقطع but does not give the name of his chief. Col Briggs (vol IV p 84) calls him "Hubeeb Khan the Kazi of Cholv Meheswur, and explains the last words by saying in a note "properly Maha Iswur". The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* does not give any designation of Habib Khān but Bayley in a note on page 253 says that the *Tabakāt-i-Akbarī* calls him governor of Ashta or Ashtanagar دالندهنگر in the text edition.

¹ The purport of the complaints is given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley page 253.

² The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley pages 254, 255 describes at some length the way in which Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī escaped with his favourite wife Rānī Kanākrā (Bayley says in a note Kanākrā means golden) on two horses provided by Kishnā, a Rājput *zamīndār*, who was also one of his guards. The village to which Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī came is called Bhakōrah in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*.

³ What follows is copied almost word for word by Firishtah, but the name of the village where the two sovereigns met is دیواله in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The account given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* Bayley page 255, is similar, but it appears from it that the name of the *dārōghā* or governor, as he is called by Bayley, was Kaisar Khān. The presents mentioned in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* are also different. They consisted of horses and elephants and male and female attendants. The account in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 319, is similar, but Qaisar Khān is described as a Gujārāt noble, and the presents are somewhat different, and the village to which Sultān Mahmūd Khiljī came is called Bhāgor.

with divine help he would be able to destroy the Purabīs and purify the kingdom of all disturbances and rebellions and restore it to his servants (euphemism for himself) He halted at the place and gave orders for the mustering of his troops and in a short time an immense army advanced into Mulwa

When Medini Ray received information of the advance of Sultān Muzaffar he left ¹ Ray Pithora with a body of Rajputs in the fort of Mandu and himself with two thousand Rajput horsemen and the elephants belonging to Sultān Mahmud proceeded to Dhar From that place he went to Rana Sanka to bring him to his aid Sultān Muzaffar advanced to Mandu with the object of laying siege to it When the army arrived near Mandu the Rajputs sallied out and fought with great bravery but in the end they fled and took shelter in the fort The next day also the Rajputs came out and fought a great battle Qiwam ul mulk exerted himself in a notable way and slew many Rajputs That day Sultān Muzaffar divided the different sides of the fort and entrusted them to the *amirs* and made the siege closer At this time Medini Ray sent a letter to Ray Pithora and informed him I have come to Rana Sanka and I am bringing him with all the Rajputs of Marwar and the neighbouring country You should keep Sultān Muzaffar inactive for the period of one month by tales and excuses Ray Pithora with great deceit and trickery sent emissaries with the following message As the fort of Mandu has for a long time been in the possession of the Rajputs and they have got their families and dependants in it they would be able to remove them and vacate the fort in the course of a month and would then make it over to him and they would also hasten to his service and become his loyal adherents if he would go back and take up a station

¹ The name is spelt in different ways in the MSS and in the lith ed But the correct spelling appears to be that I have adopted in the text Pithora as the reader will remember was the name given by the Muslim historian to the celebrated Prithi Raj of Dehli The Ray Pithora in the present case appears to have been a son of Medini Ray According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* Bayley page 956 Medini Ray sent Shadi I hān Pithora and three other Hindus to hold the fort of Mandu but according to most historians the command was confided to Ray Pithora Col Briggs (vol IV p 84) calls him Bhew Ray

According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* the emissaries went to Khudawand Khan the *raja* and he took them to the Sultan

one stage behind his present position'. Although Sultān Muzaffar knew that these people were merely temporizing and were waiting for reinforcements still as the sons and other relations of Sultān Mahmūd were in the fort he had no other alternative except to agree to their prayer and he went and took up a position three *karōhs* further back.

At this station, ¹ 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Āsūr and Burhānpūr, arrived with a fresh army and joined the Sultān. At this time news came to the latter that Mēdinī Rāy had given ² some elephants and much gold to Rānā Sānkā, and had brought him to aid and reinforce his men and they had arrived in the neighbourhood of Ujjain. The noble spirit of Sultān Muzaffar was now aroused and he sent 'Ādil Khān Fārūqī, the ruler of Āsūr and Burhānpūr and Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī to attack Rānā Sānkā and himself began anew the siege of the fort of Mandū. He devoted all his energy to it, so that the fort might be taken before the battle with Rānā Sānkā took place and ³ he stationed the *amīns* and the leaders of the different bodies, at the various stations round the fort. On the morning following the night of the 14th Safar, 924 A.H., (the Musalmāns) came in crowds from all sides of the fort, and attacked it and placing ladders (against the wall) entered the fort. The Rājput̃s performed *jauhar* and set fire to their houses, and killed their families and children, and burnt some of them, and then commenced fighting, and fought as long as they had any life left in them. Sultān Muzaffar entered the fort and ordered a general massacre. It has been stated correctly that on that day

¹ He was Sultān Muzaffar's nephew and son-in-law.

² These were some of the elephants belonging to Sultān Mahmūd which Mēdinī Rāy took with him.

³ The operations are differently described by Firishtah who says that for four days continuous attacks were made, so that the garrison had no sleep or rest. On the 5th night there was a cessation of assaults, and the garrison became careless. Then when midnight came, the soldiers went with ladders, and as they found the men in the citadel asleep, they mounted to the top of the ramparts, and slew the guards at the gate. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 85) says that false attacks were made on the first four nights, and the garrison being worn out with fatigue, on the fifth night ladders were applied and Mando fell. The Cambridge History of India, page 319, says, "On February 23rd, 1518, the day of the Hindu festival of the Holī, Māndū was carried by escalade."

19 000 Rajputs were slain. The particulars of this brief statement have been mentioned in the section about Malwa.

In haste when he had finished the massacre of the Furlah Rajputs Sultan Mahmud waited on him and offered congratulations and felicitations and inquired in great anxiety. What does Your Majesty say to this slave? Sultan Muzaffar said. May the great God make you happy with the fort of Mandu and the kingdom of Malwa. He then turned back and went to his camp. The next day he advanced towards ¹ Rana Senka. One of the notable men among the Rajputs who had been wounded and who had fled from the fort had gone to the Rana and had described to him the great power of and the ferocity of the massacre by Sultan Muzaffar in such a way that the Rana was thoroughly frightened and he fled ineffectually towards Chitor and ² that Rajput died in the same *majlis* (assembly). As Sultan Mahmud came from Mandu to Dhar and prayed that ³ The Sultan is in the place of my father and uncle. I hope that he would add fresh kindness to his former favours and would make the hotel of this insignificant one bright with the grandeur of his pleasant advent. Sultan Muzaffar accepted his prayer and went to Mandu taking Shahzadas Sikandar Khan and Latif Khan and Adil Khan the ruler of Aṣṣir and Burhanpur with him. They stayed that night at Nalcha and in the morning mounted on elephants entered the fort and dismounted at Sultan Mahmud's palace. Sultan Mahmud endeavoured to the best of his power to perform the rites of hospitality and himself standing before Sultan Muzaffar

¹ One MS. has *جنگی* *huf re Rana Senka* but neither the other MS. nor the lith. ed. has it. *منوچہ جنگ رانا سانکا* in the text-edition.

The actual words are *ورمرو رانا نگداج* lit. the Rana's liver melted. Firishtah's account does not differ materially from the text but he says that the Rana fled towards Jajpur and Adil Khan pursued him plundering and slaying those who fell behind him.

² It would appear that he was so excited that his hands and feet opened and he bled to death.

³ One MS. has a reading different from that in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. and the one which I have adopted. That reading is *کہ بھلی بندو* which would mean. Be thou in the place of the father and the uncle of this *fajir*.

waited on him. After they had finished eating, he placed presents of all kinds before Sultān Muzaffar and the Shāhzādas, and again made his excuses. Sultān Muzaffar then saw all the palaces and other buildings of the former Sultāns of Mālwa, and afterwards went back to Dhār. There he bade adieu to Sultān Mahmūd, and leaving Āṣaf Khān Gujāṭī with ten thousand horsemen to reinforce him, started for Gujāṭ. Sultān Mahmūd owing to his great affection accompanied him as far as *mauda* Dēvla, although Sultān Muzaffar had already said farewell to him, and there, after again taking leave of him, returned to Mandū.

On his arrival in Gujāṭ, Sultān Muzaffar remained for some days in Muhammadābād Chāmpānī, and the great and noble men of the country of Gujrāt hastened to wait on him, with their felicitations and congratulations, and were made happy with his largesses and favours. At this time, one day one of his courtiers reported to him, that at the time, when the shadow of his conquest had been spread over the kingdom of Mālwa, Rāy Māl, Rāja of Īdar had come out of the hills of Bijānagar, and had raided a part of the country of Pattan and the town of ¹ Gilwāra, but as Naṣrat-ul-mulk left Īdar, and advanced to give him battle, he fled and concealed himself in the caves of Bijānagar. The Sultān declared, "God willing, I will, after the rains, determine what to do in this matter." After the rains in the year 925 A H, 1519 A D, he advanced towards Īdar to chastise and punish Rāy Māl, and other disturbers of peace. As ² Rāja Māl was the protector and the asylum of Rāy Māl, the Sultān thought that the chastisement of the former should be undertaken first, and he levelled his territory to the dust, and after halting at Īdar for a few days, he came back to Muhammadābād Chāmpānī and stayed there.

¹ The name of the town is کهرالو and کهرالوار in the MSS, and کهرالو in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has فصبات الحدود without giving any names. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 87) has the town of Gilwara. I cannot find any mention of it in the Mirāt-i Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India, but Rās Mālā (vol I, p 383) agrees with Col Briggs and calls it Gilwārā کهراله in the text-edition.

² The name is راجه مال Rāja Māl in both MSS, but it is راجه مالديو Rāja Māl Dēv in the lith ed. Firishtah calls him راجه مل Rāja Māl. I cannot find him or his territory mentioned anywhere else.

After a few days news came that Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had in concert with Āṣaf Khān marched against ¹Bhim Karan Purabī with the object of seizing Hakrun when Medini Ray brought Rana Sanka to aid him and a great battle took place. Most of the *amirs* of Malwa were slain and Āṣaf Khān's son and a number of other warriors were also killed. Sultān Mahmūd received many wounds and was taken prisoner. Rana Sanka however treated him with kindness and sent him with a body of troops to Mandu. Sultān Muzaffar hearing this news became depressed and sad and sent some other *sardars* to Sultān Mahmūd's aid and wrote an affectionate letter inquiring about him. About this time Sultān Muzaffar went to Idar to see the country and to enjoy the pleasures of the chase and commenced erecting some buildings there. On his return he brought Naṣrat ul mulk to Ahmadabad with him and entrusted the government of Idar to Malik Mubārīz ul mulk.

It so happened that one day a bard or wandering minstrel waited on Mubārīz ul mulk and said something about the bravery of Rana Sanka. Mubārīz ul mulk on account of his great arrogance and pride spoke to him in improper language and giving ²a dog the name of Rana Sanka kept him tied up at the gate of Idar. The bard went back and told this story to Rana Sanka. The Rana owing to his pride and ⁴boorishness turned towards Idar and advanced and

¹ There is no mention of Bhīm Karan or Hakrun in any other history except the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, page 263) where it is said that Sultan Mahmūd marched to *sarkar* Gagrūn where he attacked Bhīm Karan and it is said in a note that Bhīm Karan is said to have been a deputy of Medini Rao and was holding Gagrūn (?) for him. He was certainly one of his chief officers and very probably a relative. Evidently some lines have been left out in the lith. ed. of *Fāṣṭah*. Col Briggs, the Cambridge History of India and Ras Mala all say that Sultan Mahmūd Khaljī had attacked the combined forces of Medini Ray and Rana Sanka and had been defeated by them.

One MS. has *طلمه* before Hakrun but the other MS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

² The Cambridge History of India page 30 says that Mubārīz ul Mulūk called the dog Sangrama. I am afraid Sangrama or the more correct Sangrama would have been Greek to Mubārīz ul Mulūk. I doubt whether Rana Sangram Singh's parents or he himself ever called himself Sangrama or Sangrama. Sangram was quite sufficient for them.

⁴ The word used is *خالط* but it appears to me to be extremely inappropriate and unjust.

ravaged the country to the boundary of Sūōhī. About this time Sultān Muzaffar went to Chāmpānī, leaving Qiwām-ul-mulk, son of Qiwām-ul-mulk, in Ahmadābād, for the control of the ¹ *grās*s.

² When Rānā Sānkā arrived in the country of ³ Bākai, the Rāja, although he was obedient and submissive to Sultān Muzaffar, in his fear and distress joined Rānā Sānkā. The latter then came to Dūngarpūr. Mubārīz-ul-mulk wrote an account of what had happened to the Sultān. As the Sultān's *vazīrs* were not friendly to Mubārīz-ul-mulk they told the Sultān that it was not ⁴ right for him to give the Rānā's name to a dog, and thus bring him into contempt, and afterwards being afraid of him, to ask for reinforcement, otherwise the Rānā would not have dared to put his foot into the Sultān's territories. It so happened, however, that at that time, the army which had been left to protect Īdar had, on account of the ⁵ excessive rains gone to their own homes at Ahmadābād and only a small number had remained with Mubārīz-ul-mulk.

¹ *Grās* according to a note on page 98 of the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* comprises (1) blackmail paid to powerful local chiefs for protection and immunity from plunder or rather land held in lieu of such blackmail, (2) lands or allowances allotted by government, or allowed to be retained by them to land holders, both as a politic measure to keep them quiet, and as a retainer for military and other services. Here apparently the word is used to mean the holders of such land.

² Firishtah's account agrees generally with the text, but he says that Rānā Sānkā plundered and ravaged Mubārīz-ul-mulk's fief before coming to Bākai, and he also says that the Sultān on hearing what his *vazīrs* told him delayed sending in reinforcements. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 264) gives a detailed account of Nizām-ul-Mulk's talk with the bard, Rānā Sānkā's march against Īdar and the former's prayer for reinforcement, and the action of the Sultān's minister about it, down to the battle of Ahmadābād and the sack of that city. Its version of the story of the dog is somewhat different from that in the other histories. It is said, that in the talk with the bard, Nizām-ul-Mulk repeatedly called the Rānā a dog, and finally he called for a dog, and having had it tied up at the door of the *darbār*, he said, "If the Rānā does not come he will be like this dog."

³ Called Bāgar in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 266, and Bagry by Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 88).

⁴ The word is *لايق* in one MS and in the lith. ed., but *مناسب* in the other MS.

⁵ One MS inserts *برسات* before *باران* و.

Rana Sinka becoming cognizant of all these things advanced against Idar. When he arrived near Mubriz ul mulk with the other *sardars* prepared for battle and went out to meet him but before the two armies should come together they turned back and returned to Idar. The *sardars* said that the small number of their friends and the vast host of their enemies were patent to all. It was advisable that they should go to Ahmadnagar and fortify themselves there till the arrival of the reinforcements and on this decision they went to the fort of Ahmadnagar taking Mubriz ul mulk with them whether he liked it or not. On the following morning Rana Sinka arrived at Idar and enquired about Mubriz ul mulk. The *grāva* who had fled from Qiwam ul mulk and had joined the Rana told him that Mubriz ul mulk was not a man that would run away but the *amir* had taken him away to Ahmadnagar and they were waiting for reinforcements. Rana Sinka then advanced against Ahmadnagar with a large force. The bard who had praised Rana Sinka in the presence of Mubriz ul mulk again went to the latter and said

Rana Sinka has come with a large army. It would be a great pity that men like you should be killed for nothing. It is advisable that you should remain in the fort of Ahmadnagar. The Rana would return after giving his horse a drink of water below the fort and he would not do anything more. Mubriz ul mulk said in reply. It is impossible that I should allow him to give water to his horse in the river. He thereupon with great bravery crossed the river with the few men that were with him and who were not a tenth part of the number of the Rana's army. When the Rana arrived there there was a great battle. Asad Khan who was one of the commanders was killed with a number of other horsemen. Sufdar Khan was wounded and Mubriz ul mulk after making several attacks on the Rana's troops received many wounds and most of the Cuyratls

¹ I show I suppose that I take me as far as the fort and Mubriz ul mulk had not dared to come out. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 89) says 'till his horse drank out of the ditch of Ahmadnuggur' but I suppose the next sentence shows that he meant the river which flows below the city and the fort.

² The clause is as I have it in the text in both the MSS and in the lithed. But it appears to be redundant. I read in mss *حی* before *اکبر* and omits the *و* after *سدد*. This improves the clause a great deal. The meaning of the

were slain Mubārīz-ul-mulk and Safdar Khān now retired to Ahmadābād The Rānā ravaged Ahmadnagar, and halted there for one day The next morning he ¹ marched towards Badnagar When he arrived near it, most of the inhabitants came to him and said, 'We are *zunnādāns* (men with the sacred thread, Brahmans) and your forefathers have always respected and honoured us' Rānā Sānkā ² desisted from attacking and plundering Badnagar and advanced to ³ Bēsalnagar ⁴ Malik Hatim the *thānadār* of the place came out with the resolution of becoming a martyr, and gave him battle, and attained his object Rānā Sānkā after ravaging Bēsalnagar returned to his own country

amended clause is, as most of the Gujrātīs were slain Mubārīz ul-mulk and Safdar Khān retired to Ahmadābād

¹ The readings are different One MS has متوجه بدرنگر کردید, marched towards Badnagar The other has عاظم بدرنگر کردید The lith ed has متوجه بدرنگر و مسلنگر کردید Firishtah has متوجه بدرنگر گردید I have adopted this, as it agrees with the reading in the first MS The place is called Barnagar in the *Mirāt ı Sikandarī* and Vadnagar in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 320 I do not know why and how بدرنگر has been transformed into Vadnagar The *Mirāt ı Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 269, says that the *grāssiahs* incited the Rānā to plunder Barnagar, as the inhabitants of the place were merchants, and who were very rich, but the Rānā did not on the representation of the inhabitants, as stated in the text, allow the place to be plundered

² The *Mirāt ı Sikandarī* and the *Cambridge History of India* say that Rānā Sānkā accepted tribute from the people, but neither the *Tabaqāt* nor Firishtah says so A Brahman who has always called himself a mendicant is not likely to have paid much tribute

³ The place is written like بيسالنگر Bēsalnagar in the MSS and in the lith ed In the lith ed of Firishtah it looks like Bēlnagar Col Briggs has Beesalnuggur The *Mirāt ı Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 269, has Bisalnagar The *Cambridge History of India*, page 320, has Visnagar I think Bēsalnagar is identical with the hills of Bījānāgar, to which the Rājās of Īdar used to escape whenever hard pressed by the Sultāns of Gujrāt, and which the *Cambridge History of India* had in previous pages called Bichabhera (page 318) and Vajnagar hills (page 319) and now gives it the entirely new name of Visnagar (see notes 1, page 300 and 3, page 301) بيلنگر Bēlnagar in the text edition

⁴ Contrary to what is stated here, and in Firishtah, the *Mirāt ı Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 269, says, he shut himself in the fort and it was beleaguered till the hour of evening prayer, and in the fighting and confusion the town was plundered

¹ Malik Qiwam ul mulk sent a detachment with Mubariz ul mulk and Şafdar Khan to Ahmadnagar that they might bury the dead. Mubariz ul mull arrived at Ahmadnagar and buried the martyrs. About this time the *Kolis* and *grassias* from the neighbourhood of Īdar seeing the small force under Mubariz ul mulk's command attacked him. Mubariz ul mulk came out of the fort and fought with them and after slaying sixty one of the leaders of the *grassias* returned victorious and triumphant to Ahmadnagar. As Ahmadnagar however was in ruin ² and the people suffered privations for want of grain and all other necessities they started from there and came to the ⁴ town of Parantej.

When news of all these events reached Sulṭān Muzaṣṣar the latter appointed ⁵ Imad ul mulk and Qasir Khan with an enormous army and one hundred elephants to crush Rana Sanka. Imad ul mulk and Qasir Khan arrived at Ahmadabid and taking Qiwam ul mulk with them went to Parantej. From that place they wrote to the Sulṭān that Rana Sanka had returned to his own country and asked

¹ The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* Bayley page 20 gives a fairly detailed account of how Kiam ul Mulk started to reinforce Mubariz ul Mulk how he heard of the latter's defeat and sent for him with the object of going in pursuit but hearing that this was impossible sent Mubariz ul Mulk to bury the dead and this was done sixteen days after the battle.

Firishtah agrees with the text but Col Briggs (vol IV p 90) says that the *Kolis* and *Grassias* attacked Mubariz ul Mulk on the march to Ahmadnagar but were defeated. Rawlinson also says so. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* Bayley page 70 says that the *Kolis* of Kanth came to carry off grain from Ahmadnagar.

² There is no *و* in this place in the MS or in the lith ed but I have inserted it as it is required to complete the sentence.

⁴ The name appears to be *وہنج* Wahinj and *دھنج* Dahej in the MS and *ہنج* H ch in the lith ed and *راہنج* Rahej in the lith ed of Firishtah. Col Briggs has Parantej. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* Bayley page 70 has Parantej and Ras Malal as Poorantej. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. I have adopted Parantej. M Hidayat Hosain however has *دھنج* Dahlj in the text-edition.

⁵ There are slight variations in the readings. The lith ed has *رجع* before *فل* but the MSS omit the words and one MS and the lith ed have *برسر رانا سانکا* but the other MS has *بدع رانا سانکا*.

for permission to march to Chitōr. The Sultān wrote in reply, that as the rains had commenced they should wait in Ahmadnagar, and after the rains should advance towards Chitōr. The *amīrs*, in accordance with this order remained at Ahmadnagar. Sultān Muzaffar paid the soldiers a year's wages from the treasury and ¹ went to Ahmadābād. He intended to march to Chitōr himself to chastise Rānā Sānkā.

At this time ² Malīk Ayāz Sultānī came from Sōrāth with a large army, and after rendering homage represented that the ³ imperial grandeur of the Sultān is higher and more exalted, than that he should go in person to punish and chastise Rānā Sānkā. The training of slaves like myself is for the purpose, that if a work like this has to be done, the Sultān should not have to take the trouble to do it. In the month of Muharram in the year 927 A H (December, 1520 A D) Sultān Muzaffar arrived at Ahmadnagar. When the army had all collected Malīk Ayāz ⁴ again prayed (that he should be employed)

¹ Firishtah lith ed agrees with the text, but the place where the *amīrs* remained is called سركچ Sarkach, or Sarkhēj, and calls the Rānā's capital Jaipūr instead of Chitōr. He also says that the Sultān ordered the payment of one year's wages to the soldiers. Col Briggs has a different account. He says Imad-ool-Moolk and Keisur Khan retreated from Ahmudnuggur, but the Sultan ordered them to remain there during the rains, and he intended to advance to Chittoor in person after the rains. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 271, says that the allowances of the whole army were increased from ten to twenty per cent, and a year's pay was issued from the treasury, so that every man might provide himself with all that was requisite for the campaign.

² According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 233, Malīk Aīāz "was originally a purchased slave, yet he attained to the rule of provinces, and to unlimited wealth." Bayley also says in a note that some authorities declare he was a renegade Portuguese, but this assertion seems opposed to such an origin. He was possibly a slave brought from the southern provinces of Europe or Asia Minor or Armenia by the Turks. But contrary to this Firishtah says ايار حاص *aiyar has*, and Col Briggs has "originally a slave born in the king's family" (vol IV, p 90).

³ In the corresponding passage, Firishtah has a و between کنراى and حلال.

⁴ This would be somewhat impertinent on his part, but Firishtah says, that when he made the request on the previous occasion, the Sultān did not give any reply.

to chastise Rana Sanku. The Sultan sent him for that purpose with one *lakh* horsemen and a hundred elephants. He also sent ¹ Qawam ul mulk with twenty thousand horsemen a little later to join Malik Ayaz. When the two commanders encamped at Mahrasi the Sultan with great caution and farsight sent Taj Khan and Nizam ul mulk Sultan also to that place (to join them). Malik Ayaz sent a representation to the Sultan in which he submitted that the act of sending so many great *amirs* for the punishment of Rana Sanku would be a reason for his pride and glorification. He also reported that so many elephants were not at all necessary and that this slave (i.e. he himself) owing to the grandeur of His Majesty was quite sufficient for this service and after ² sending back most of the elephants he marched from Mahrasi and encamped at the village of ³ Dhol. From that place many detachments were sent out to plunder and ravage the country. Safdar Khan was sent from here to chastise the Rajputs of ⁴ Lakia Kot. He marched to this place which was in a rough and uneven country and ravaged it and slew many Rajputs and taking those who escaped the sword with him as prisoners of war re joined Malik Ayaz. They marched from that place and having burnt down and rased to the ground Dungarpur and Banswala advanced

¹ The Mirat Sikandari says on the authority of the Tarikh Bahadar Shah Bayley page 272 that he had a hundred elephants in addition to one hundred thousand horsemen.

Firishtah lith ed agrees but Col Briggs says that he left behind him nearly all the elephants and the greater part of the cavalry which had lately joined (vol IV p 91).

³ The village is called Dhol in one MS and in the lith ed and Dadud in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or by Col Briggs but the Mirat Sikandar Bayley page 27 calls it Dhamolah in the district of Bagar but in a note which purports to be a translation of a passage of the Tabakat Bayley calls it Dabal.

⁴ The name is لکھا کوٹ in the lith ed of Firishtah. It is not mentioned by Col Briggs or in the Mirat Sikandari but Bayley translates a part of the Tabakat in a note call it Lakia Kot. The Cambridge History of India (p 30) mentions Galia Kot and Banswala among the five places which were ravaged and gives the lat and long of each. Apparently the author had a map on a very large scale in which all these places were marked and from which their lat and long could be calculated. Galia Kot is probably identical with Lakia Kot and Banswala with Banswala.

towards Chitōi. It so happened that at this station, a man came and gave information to ¹Malik Ashja'-ul-mulk and Safdar Khān, that Udaya Singh, Rāja of ²Māl, had, with a body of Rājput soldiers of Rānā Sānkā and Ugar Sēn Pūrabīa, come and were lying in ambush behind a hill, and they wanted to make a night attack. Ashja'-ul-mulk and Safdar Khān without sending any information to Malik Ayāz Sultānī, galloped to that place, taking two hundred horsemen with them. There was a great battle. Ugar Sēn was wounded, and fifty Rājputs fell on the battlefield, and the other Rājputs fled. When Ayāz Sultānī came to know of these happenings, he advanced with his army fully equipped to reinforce and help Safdar Khān. When he reached the battlefield, he was amazed at the (gallant) efforts of Safdar Khān, and applied the ointment of kindness on the wounds of the ghāzīs (victorious heroes of Islām).

On the following morning, Malik Qawām-ul-mulk Sultānī penetrated into the hill of Bānswāla in pursuit of the men (i.e., those who had fled), and did not leave a vestige of men and habitation there. Ugar Sēn, wounded as he was, went to the Rānā, and told him all that had happened. When Malik Ayāz arrived at Mandisōr, and besieged it, Rānā Sānkā came to the aid of his *thānadār*, and halting at a distance of twelve *karōhs* from Mandisōr sent ³the following

¹ One MS. calls him *ملك شيخ المصالح* but the other and the lith. ed. omit *شيخ*. Firishtah calls him Malik Ashja' ul mulk, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 91), apparently following the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, calls him Shooja ool-Moolk Bayley, of course, calls him Shujā'-ul-Mulk.

² The name of the place is *مال* Mal, and *نال* Nal in the MSS. and *بال* Pal in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is *مال* Mal, but Col. Briggs calls the Rāja the Ray of Poloh. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* does not give the name of the Rāja, but calls him the Rājah of Bānswālah. Firishtah's account of the information of the intended night attack, and the skirmish with the men who were in ambush, agrees word for word with the text. The account in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* is somewhat different. Ugar Sēn is not named, but is probably included in "some relatives of Mēdini Rāo." It is also said that the Musulmāns were greatly outnumbered but they fought bravely and defeated the Rājputs (Bayley, p. 272).

³ The lith. ed. of Firishtah gives the same version of the message as the text, but Col. Briggs says that "there were certain conditions so extravagant, that Mullik Eiaz determined to continue the siege." The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*,

message to Malik Ayaz I am sending ambassadors to wait on the Sultan and I shall be enlisted among his adherents Do you abandon the siege Malik Ayaz made some polite speeches which had really no meaning to the messengers and devoted all his energy to the capture of the fort and carried the mines so far that it became a matter of to day or to morrow

At this time ¹ Sharzāh Khān Sharwānī came from Sultan Mahmud Khānī and delivered a message to Malik Ayaz to the effect that if there was any necessity for help and reinforcement he would at once come to render it Malik Ayaz was delighted and asked him to come As Sultan Mahmud was bound by ties of gratitude to Muzaffar Shah he came to Mandisor bringing Silahadī Purābia with him Rana Sinka was frightened at the coming of Sultan Mahmud and sent Medini Ray to Silahadī with the following message It is right that one should favour one's own community It is right therefore that he should not hold himself excused from rendering his duty to his community and at present ³ he should exert himself in bringing about a treaty of peace

After some days things came to such a pass that the garrison was reduced to the greatest straits Qawam ul mulk advanced his battery

Bayley page 273 gives the terms of the message in some detail but I do not find anything extravagant in them

¹ The name is mentioned only in the Ṭabaqāt and in Firishtah It is Sharzāh in the MS of the Ṭabaqāt and in the lith ed of Firishtah In the lith ed of the Ṭabaqāt it is Shēr The MS of the Ṭabaqāt has Sarwānī but the lith eds of both the Ṭabaqāt and Firishtah have Sharwānī

The name of Silahadī is written as سلاهیدی in both MSS and in the lith ed of the Ṭabaqāt but in the lith ed of Firishtah it is سلهدی In the Mirat-i Sikandarī Bayley page 3 he is called Silahadī a Tuar Rajput by tribe but Bayley says in a note that the description of Silahadī's tribe is only in MS A and there also doubtful On an earlier page I ventured a guess in respect of another Silahadī that the name might be a corruption of Salya Deva but it occurs to me now that it is more probably a corruption of Sādrī the rocky mountain

The Mirat-i Sikandar tells a different story about Silahadī It says he was coming from Raisān with one hundred thousand horse to have an interview with Malik Ayaz but Medini Ray went and met him on the way and enticed him over to the Rana

³ Firishtah adds ای سیرجند سعی کرد صلح نماید although Silahadī made (every) effort peace could not be effected

and wanted to get into the fort. Malik Ayāz, fearing that the victory might be attributed to Qawām-ul-mulk, kept him back that day from engaging the enemy. The *amīns* of Gujrāt, hearing of this intention, were grieved in their hearts against Malik Ayāz. Mubārīz-ul-mulk and some other commanders advanced the next morning to fight with Rānā Sānkā's troops, without taking his permission. Malik Tughlaq Shāh Fūlādī went and brought them back from the way. There was now a discussion among the *amīns*, but for fear of the punishment by the Sultān, they could not advance again without the permission of Malik Ayāz. The latter, in spite of the opposition of the *amīns*, made his soldiers ready, and set fire to the mines. When the bastion was shattered and fell down, it was found, that the Rājput̃s having become aware of the state of things, had built another wall opposite to the bastion.

The next day emissaries came from Rānā Sānkā, and said, "The Rānā says that the slave (*i e*, he himself) wants to become enlisted among the loyal adherents (of the Sultān), and ¹ to send back the elephants which he had seized in the invasion of Ahmadnagar, with his son, for the service of the Sultān. He did not know what was the reason of all this unkindness and harshness on their part." Malik Ayāz, owing to the opposition of Malik Qawām-ul-mulk, gave his consent to the proposed peace and began to settle the terms. The other *amīns* refused their consent, and waited upon Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, and inviting him to carry on the war, determined that they should begin the battle on the following Wednesday. A man who was present at the assembly waited on Malik Ayāz, and informed him of all that has passed. Malik Ayāz sent a man that very moment to wait on Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, and represented to him that His Majesty the Sultān had entrusted the reins of controlling the army in his hands, so that he may carry into effect everything in which he saw its welfare, and now that he (*i e*, Sultān Mahmūd) at the instigation and incitement of the *amīns* of Gujrāt wanted to carry on the war, this slave could not agree to that, for there was a great probability, that on account of the ill-luck, which always attends on perversity and dissension, the hand of hope will not reach the skirts of our object.

¹ This was one of the terms of the previous message of Rānā Sānkā given in the *Mirāt i Sikandarī* (see note 3, page 314)

On the morning of Wednesday which had been selected for the battle Malik Ayaz moved his camp and encamped at Khalbipur and after bestowing robes of honour on the emissaries of Rana Sanka¹ gave them leave to go back. Sultan Mahmud Khalbī also marched away in the direction of Mandu. When Malik Ayaz had the honour of waiting on the Sultan at Champanir he reproved and reprimanded him and gave him permission to go to the port of Dip so that after equipping his retainers he might return and wait on the Sultan after the rains. It was also settled that after the end of the rains the Sultan in his own august person should proceed to chastise the² Rana.

Malik Ayaz sent one of his trustworthy men to Rana Sanka and gave him this message. As friendship has grown up between us it is proper that we should both do everything that may be beneficial and advantageous to each other and as on account of the return of the *amirs* from that country the noble heart of the Sultan has become heavy and he wishes that the shadow of his conquest should be cast over that country and he should punish the insurgents. This will cause much evil to that country. It is right and proper that he should send his son on the wings of peace with tribute and much beautiful presents so that the inhabitants of that country might be preserved from the assaults of the Sultan's wrath. Sultan Muzaffar came from Chāmpanir to Ahmadabad in the month of Muharram of 4928 A H (December 1521 A D) so that he might advance towards Chitor after making the necessary preparations. In the

¹ Firishtah agrees with the text but the Mirat-i Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India say that Malik Ayaz concluded peace with Rana Sanka. He could not have done so without the Sultan's express order and it appears from what happened later that the Sultan intended to carry on the war. Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 93) says: A suspension of hostilities was accordingly agreed on until communications could be received from the king. But this is not mentioned by Firishtah.

The Mirat-i Sikandari Bayley page 75 says that in consequence of his displeasure the Sultan did not give Malik Ayaz the usual robe of honour at his departure.

² One MS. has Sanka after Rana but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. do not have it.

⁴ The year is 15 A D in the Cambridge History of India page 31 and 999 A H 153 A D in the Mirat-i Sikandar Bayley page 75.

course of some days he collected and equipped an army at Ahmadābād, and encamped at the reservoir of Kānkriā, and there was a ¹ delay of three days at this place for the mustering of the troops. At this time news came that Rānā Sānkā had sent his son with much tribute to wait on the Sultān, and the son had arrived at the town of Mahiāsa. After a few days, when he waited on the Sultān, and presented the beautiful things (which he had brought), the Sultān forgave his father's offences, and presented to him a princely robe of honour, and having ² cancelled the mustering of the army, he spent some days in the neighbourhood of Jhālāwār in seeing the country and hunting, and then went to Ahmadābād. There he again ³ bestowed a robe of honour on the son of the Rānā, and bade him farewell. After that he himself went to ⁴ Kapatbhanj.

In this year Malik Aīz, who was a support of the empire, bound up the goods of existence (i.e., died). Sultān Muzaffar was ⁵ pained and grieved on hearing this news and conferred his *jāgīr* on his ⁶ eldest son.

In the year 7930 A.H., 1524 A.D. (the Sultān) rode out from Chāmpānīr, in order to chastise some rebels and refractory persons,

¹ The word **توقه** delay, is to be found in only one of the MSS., but is not in the other or in the lith. ed. I have, however, inserted it as it appears to be required.

² The MSS. and the lith. ed. have **فتح ان لشكر نمود**. This is so clearly a mistake that I have had no hesitation in substituting **فتح مسيح** for **فتح**. I find the lith. ed. of Firishtah has the correct word. The text-edition has the reading in the MSS.

³ One MS. has **نمود** instead of **نمود**.

⁴ Firishtah lith. ed. says he went to Saikhōj, but no other historian mentions either Kapatbhanj or Saikhōj. **سرکیم** in the text edition.

⁵ Firishtah also says so, but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 275, says, "When the Sultan heard of Malik Aīz's death, he said, 'The life of Malik Aīz has come to its close. It would have been better, if he had been killed fighting against the Rānā, for then he would have been a martyr'."

⁶ The MSS. and the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt* have **برزرگ**, but Firishtah lith. ed. omits **برزرگ**. Col. Briggs also has "some" without any qualifying adjective, but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* has "to his eldest son Ishāk."

⁷ Firishtah agrees almost word for word, but Col. Briggs changes the year to 929 A.H., and says, he marched to Champanere and "caused the town of

and halted for some days between the towns of Mahrasā and Harsol. He entirely rebuilt the fort of Mahrasā and then returned towards Ahmadabad. On the way ¹ he heard that the member of the harem (of the Sultān) who was most beloved of him had died. The Sultān and the Shihzada grieved sorely and they went to her grave and performed the mourning rites. After the termination of the period of mourning they came to Ahmadabad with sorrow stricken hearts and grief laden minds. The Sultān passed most of his time in indulging in his grief. One day Khudawand Khan who was distinguished among the *amirs* and the *ra'is* for his intellect and wisdom waited on the Sultān and represented in clear language the advantage and benefit of patience and freed him from grief and pain. As the rainy season had commenced he induced the Sultān to take a trip to Champanir. The Sultān remembered the breezes of Champanir and went there.

One day Ālam Khan son of Sultān Sikandar Ludi Badshah of Dehli represented to the Sultān that ³ Sultān Ibrahim son of Sultān Sikandar had owing to his inexperience drawn his blood drinking sword out of the scabbard and had put the great *amirs* to death and those who had escaped the sword had sent repeated letters and petitions and had asked this slave (i.e. himself) to come. As this *faqir* had

Mahrassa to be repaired. The *Mirat-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 276 agree generally with the text. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matters at all.

¹ Firsihtal copies the *Tabaqat* almost *verbatim*. Col Briggs and the Cambridge History of India do not mention the death. The *Mirat-i-Sikandar* Bayley page 6 says: "On the way his chief wife Bibi Rami mother of prince Sikandar Khan died" which would imply that she was travelling with the Sultān. The *Mirat-i-Sikandari* praises her right judgment, her great influence in the affairs of the kingdom, her motherly care of high and low and the singular firmness of her judgments.

The *Mirat-i-Sikandari* says he fell ill and after his recovery went to Champanir or as Bayley calls the place Muhammadabad. It does not mention Khudawand Khan's advice and admonition.

³ This long winded and highly metaphorical request is copied by Firsihtal. Ālam Khan was a son of Bahlul Ludi and not of Sikandar Ludi as stated in the text and he was therefore an uncle of Ibrahim. As stated in the text his later career is narrated in the section about Dehli. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 95) calls him Jalal Khan.

attended on Your Majesty for a long time in the hope that by the advantage of the attention of this great family he would arrive at greatness, now that time has come, that the star of his good fortune would ascend from the *nāḍī* of defeat, and the image of hope should shine in the mirror of success, he hopes that the wing of (the Sultān's) generosity and the shadow of his kindness, should be spread over the head of this *faqīr*, so that his ancestral dominion should come into his possession ' Sultān Muzaḥḥar sent him back with a detachment of troops and gave him some money. He advanced towards Dehlī to fight with Sultān Ibrāhīm. A full account of his adventures has been given in the section about Dehlī.

In the year 931 A H ¹ (1524 A D) the Sultān went through Chāmpānī to Īḍar. On the way Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān complained about his meagre income, and his large expenses, and prayed that his allowance may be made equal to that of Shāhzāda Sikandar Khān. The Sultān delayed in fulfilling his expectations on account of certain objections, and made a promise for a future consideration. Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān was pained and discouraged at this, and went away to Ahmadābād without obtaining the Sultān's leave. He went from there to the country of ² Māl. The Raja of Māl whose name was

¹ Bayley (p. 277) gives 1525 as the corresponding year of the Christian era, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 96) has 1524, and the Cambridge History of India, page 321, has, "late in 1524."

² As regards Māl see note 2, page 314. M. Hidayat Hosain in the text-edition has مالو for مال. Firishtah lith. ed. does not here give the name of the Rājā, but calls him the Rājā of Māl, but the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī gives the name as Rāwal Udī Singh (as Bayley transliterates it) and describes him as Rājā of Dūngarpūr. Bayley, however, says in a note that the Tabakāt "calls him the Rājā of Pāl", and goes on to say that "Pāl seems to have been used in those days, as a kind of general name given to a congeries of petty hill states, of which the rulers were Hindūs and probably all or nearly all Rajpūts. They seem to have included Dūngarpūr, Bijanagar, Bānsbālah and others" (Bayley, page 277). Col. Briggs calls the Raja Oodiy Singh the Raja of Poloh, and the Cambridge History of India (p. 321), apparently following the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī, Udai Singh of Dūngarpur. The account of the travels of Bahādur Khān as given by Firishtah agrees almost word for word with that in the text and by Col. Briggs, the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India also agree generally, but the last two do not mention the pilgrimage to the tomb of the holy Khwājah at Ajmēr.

Udai Singh considered the arrival of the Shahzada a very great blessing and rendered him services of various kinds. Then when the Shahzada went to the country of Chitor Rana Sanka came forward to welcome him and presented him with articles of every kind as tribute. He submitted 'This country belongs to your servants and whatever you order will be obeyed'. The Shahzada out of his noble spirit did everything to please him but after rejecting his prayer proceeded to go on pilgrimage to the tomb which is the resting place of illuminating rays of his Holiness Khwajah Mu'in ud din Hasan Sijari may his soul be sanctified! After performing the pilgrimage he proceeded to the country of Miwat where Hasan Khan Miwati advanced some stages and carried out the rites of hospitality and entertainment and from that place he went towards Dehli.

It so happened that at this time His Majesty Firdus Makani Zahir ud din Muhammad Babur Badshah had come to ¹ Hindustan with the desire of conquering the country and had encamped in the neighbourhood of Dehli. Sultan Ibrahim having gained power and help from the arrival of Shahzada Bahadur Khan treated him with the greatest respect and honour. One day the Shahzada mounted his horse and with some of the Gujrat warriors went to the battlefield and fought with ³ some Maghul soldiers and both parties exerted themselves with great bravery. The Afghan *amirs* who were thoroughly disgusted with Sultan Ibrahim wanted to do away with him and place ⁴ Sultan Bahadur on the throne. Sultan Ibrahim hearing

¹ One MS and the lith ed have بهندوستان but the other MS has ہندوستان. The name of the Shahzada is omitted in the text edition.

³ One MS and the lith ed have بہادران but the other has بہادر خان. This is apparently a mistake. The word معرل is in both MSS after بہادران but not in the lith ed but I have inserted it.

The Mirat-i-Sikandari (Bayley p. 18) gives a different version of the according to which Bahadur Khan with some of his own men pursued a part of Moghals who were carrying off some of Sultan Ibrahim's men as prisoners and on coming up with them slew some of them and returned with the men he had rescued.

⁴ He is called Sultan in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in the lith ed of Firishtah in this place though further on he is again called Shahzada.

this had treacherous thoughts in his mind, and Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān perceiving this started towards ¹Jaunpūr

When the news that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehli, and Firdūs Makānī Bābar Bādshāh had arrived in those parts with the Maghlūl army reached Sultān Muzaffar, ² he on account of the separation from his son became depressed and sorrowful, and ordered Khudāwand Khān to send letters and petitions to summon the Shāhzāda. At this time there was a great famine in Gujrāt, and the people suffered great distress. Sultān Muzaffar, owing to the love which he had for the people, ³ began a complete recitation of the great book (*Qurān*) and of the six canonical books of Hadīs (مصاحح سنة). The great and Holy God taking account of the true and pious intention of the Sultān removed the calamity from his people. At the same time, the Sultān fell ill, and his illness increased from day to day. One day he in great sorrow spoke of Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān. Someone taking advantage of the opportunity informed him that the army was divided into ⁴ two factions. One of them wanted the succession

¹ The Cambridge History of India, page 321, says that he possibly selected "this town in response to an invitation received from the local nobles, who are said to have offered him the throne". This is also stated in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 279, but it also appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* that he was about to go to Jōnpūr, when he heard of the death of his father, and went off to Gujrāt.

² Bayley, page 279, says that Sultān Muzaffar was exceedingly vexed on hearing that Bahādur Khān had gone to Dehli, and then says in a note that according to the *Tabakāt-i-Akbari*, "he distinctly stated, as his reason that he was afraid lest Bahādur Khān by fighting against the Moghals, might involve the country of Gujrāt in hostilities with the latter people". There is nothing like this in the *Tabaqāt* as far as I can see.

³ I suppose, as a pious act, which would avert the calamity from his people. The actual words are شروع در اتم مصحف و اتم مصاحح سنة نمود. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*'s account is different. It says, on the authority of the *Tārīkh-i-Bahādar Shāhī*, that Sultān Muzaffar lifted up his hands in prayer to God, and said, "Oh Lord, if for any fault of mine my people are afflicted, take me from this world, and leave my people unharmed, and relieve them from this drought". This reminds one of Bābar's act of devoting himself for affecting the recovery of Humāyūn from his illness. But in this case Sultān Muzaffar offered himself up, not for the sake of his dear son, but for relieving the distress of his subjects.

⁴ One MS inserts سنة after اند.

of Shahzāda Sikandar K̲han while the other was inclined towards Latif K̲han Sultan Muzaffar on hearing this said Has any news come from Shahzāda Bahādur K̲han? Intelligent and wise men have inferred from this that he wished to make Shāhzada Bahādur K̲han his heir He then called Sikandar K̲han to his presence and gave him some advice in the matter of his brothers and then gave him leave to retire ¹ Then he went to the *haram sera* and again came back outside and rested for a moment After a moment he heard the call of Friday prayer He said I do not find the strength in me to go to the *masjid* He sent the men who were there to the mosque and said the mudday prayer After he had finished he rested for a moment and then passed away into the mercy of God The period of his reign was fourteen years and nine months

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN SIKANDAR SON OF SULTĀN MUZAFFAR SHAH

As the inevitable happened to Sultan Muzaffar Shahzāda Sikandar K̲han by the exertions of Imad ud mulk Sultani and K̲hudawand K̲han and Fath K̲han son of Fath K̲han sat on the throne of the empire He sent the body of his father to the town of Sarkhej and performed the rites of mourning

¹ This is a very simple and as it appears to me a very graphic and impressive word picture of the passing away of a good man Firishtah as usual copies the sentences almost word for word but he adds the day and date which were Friday the 1st Jumādī ul awwal 93 A H Firishtah also says that he died *in his forty second year and was a pious Musalman and a good calligraphist* That he always copied the *Quran* and as the copies were finished sent them to the two sacred places That many great men from Iran Turan Rum and Arabistan came to Gujrat in his reign but he gives the name of only one namely Mulla Mahmud Sawash who was a great calligraphist and came from Shiraz Col Briggs gives the 3rd Jumādī ul awwal 93^o 17th February 1515 as the date of his death and says he died in his 50th year (vol IV p 97)

The *Mirāt* Sikandari describes the death scene at somewhat greater length Bayley page 81 and it also describes his character giving many anecdotes extending over many pages The *Mirāt* Sikandari says Bayley page 81 that Sultan Muzaffar died on the 2nd Jumādī ul akhīr 93 A H (1515 A D) but places the accession of Sultan Sikandar (page 307) on the 2nd Jumādī ul akhīr 93 A H 11th April 1516 The Cambridge History of India (p 390) has the 11th April 1516 as the date of Sultan Muzaffar's death

On the 3rd day, ¹ at the end of those rites, he proceeded to Chāmpānīr. When he arrived in the town of ² Batūh, he ³ went on a pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy men of the place. He heard that ⁴ Shāh Shaikh Jīū, who was one of the descendants of Qutb ‘Alam Shaikh Burhān-ud-dīn, had said, that the kingdom would pass to Shāhzāda Bahādur Khān, he attributed false speaking to Shāh Shaikh Jīū, and spoke unseemly words about him. When he arrived at Chāmpānīr, he showed favour ⁵ to his own servants, and conferred fiefs on them and did not show any kindness whatever to the *amīns* of his father and grandfather. Owing to this reason all the *amīns* ⁶ were sick at heart, and thoroughly vexed, and waited for what might appear from the womb of divine providence. ⁷ Simā ‘Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī, who was one of the Muzaffar Shāhi slaves, and the slave of the mother of Sikandar Shāh, was very much aggrieved in his heart.

¹ The text in both MSS and in the lith ed is as I have got it, but Firishtah lith ed has *دو سیم اور بعیت برحاسته*. This makes better sense. Firishtah begins the account of the reign by saying that there were two factions, the larger one in favour of Sikandar Khān, and the smaller in that of Latif Khān, but as Sultān Muzaffar had appointed Sultān Sikandar to be his heir, the great nobles took his side, and Latif Khān being unable to assert his claim went away to his fief of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār.

² *نوة* and *سوة* in MSS. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted the former in the text edition.

³ Firishtah agrees but the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, page 307, says that “he went away without caring to visit the tombs of the holy men at Batōh.”

⁴ The name is *شیم حو* and *شیم حون* in the MSS, and *شیم حو* in two places in the lith ed. In the lith ed of Firishtah it is *شیم حو*, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 98) has Shah Sheikjee. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 307, has Shēkh Jīū.

⁵ Firishtah explains *بودد* *که نوکران ایام شاهرا دگی بودد*, i.e., who were his servants, during the time when he was a Shāhzāda.

⁶ The word *کشته*, which I have inserted in the text, is in one MS, but not in the other MS or in the lith ed.

⁷ The prefix *ام* occurs in both MSS, but not in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed calls him ‘Imād-ul-mulk Habshī, and the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley page 308, calls him, “‘Imād-ul-mulk Khush-kadam, who was a king in his own way.” The meaning of the last clause is not clear. The Cambridge History of India, page 322, calls him “Imād-ul Mulk Khush Qadam.”

Some of those who had been honoured by Sultān Sikandar also now began to commit improper acts. The hearts of the soldiers and the *raiyats* now became altogether averse (to Sultān Sikandar) and they prayed to God for his destruction. One day Sultān Sikandar arranged a special *darbar* and conferred robes of honour and seventeen hundred horses on the *amirs* and the chief men of the kingdom but as most of these were bestowed on undeserving persons the people applied their energies to the coming of Shahzāda Bahādur Khan and hoped for his return. Sultān Sikandar becoming cognizant of what was happening became anxious and alarmed about his final destiny. At this time also he came to know that Shahzāda Latif Khan who was in the neighbourhood of Nādarbar and Sultānpur had thoughts about seizing the throne and was waiting for a suitable opportunity. On hearing this news he conferred the title of Sharzāh Khan on ¹ Malik Latif Khan Bariwal and appointed him to attack and put down Latif Khan. ² Malik Latif Khan went to the border of Nādarbar and came to know that Latif Khan was in the ³ hilly country of Munka Bāham and the jungle of Chitor. Malik Latif without waiting at all entered the jungle of Chitōr and the Raja of the jungle relying on (the density) of the forest and the roughness of the country came forward to meet him. Malik Latif with a number of noted chieftains was slain in the battle and as the road of retreat was closed the Rajputs and *kolis* attacked the army from behind and slew seventeen hundred men.

¹ He is called Malik Latif Khan Barwal in the MSS as well as in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has Malik Latif Khan Bar dar. Col Briggs (vol IV p 99) has Mullik Luteef without any suffix. The Mirat-i-Sikandar al o calls him Malik Latif while the Cambridge History of India (p 32) says that the force against Latif Khan was under Sharza Khan.

One MS omits *Khan*.

² There is some difference in the readings. One MS has در کوهستان موکا بهم. The other has the same except that it has بهم instead of بهم. The lith ed has در کوهستان موکا بهم و جنگل حدور. Firishtah lith ed has در کوهستان موکا هم و جنگل به نور. Col Briggs (vol IV p 99) has had gone to Chittoor. The Mirat-i-Sikandar Bayley page 308 has had set him self up in the hill country of Sultānpur and Nandarbar with the support of Bhūm Rajah of Munka and the Cambridge History of India page 32 has he retreated into Baglana. I have adopted the reading in the first MS.

The people of Gujrāt, considering this defeat to mean an omen of the downfall of Sultān Sikandar, awaited further results. Sultān Sikandar appointed ¹ Qaiṣar Khān with a large army for the punishment of those wretched people.

While these things were happening, some of the Muzaffarī *amīrs* who were noted for their wickedness said to 'Imād-ul-mulk, "Sultān Sikandar wants to put you to death, as there are relations of sincere attachments between you and us, we have informed you." As 'Imād-ul-mulk made himself ² intoxicated with what those men of evil destiny told him, (he determined) that by any means that might be possible he would remove Sultān Sikandar from the way, and would raise one of the ³ infant sons of Muzaffar Shāh on the throne, and himself carry on the political and revenue administration of the country. One day Sikandar rode out on his horse. 'Imād-ul-mulk completely armed his retainers and followed him with the intention of murdering him, but found no opportunity. On the way, some persons disclosed the state of things to Sultān Sikandar, but he, in his simple-mindedness, said in reply, "The people want that I should harass the *amīrs*, and particularly the slaves of Muzaffar Shāh. 'Imād-ul-mulk is one of our hereditary slaves. How should he attempt such a wicked act?" In spite of what he said, however, he became grieved and pained at what he had heard. He told one of his intimates and confidants, that it is repeated among the common people from time to time that Bahādur Shāh is coming from Dehlī to conquer Gujrāt, this becomes the cause of worry to their minds.

It so happened, that on that very night, he saw in a ⁴ dream His Holiness the leader of the wayfarers in the path of the faith, Saiyid

¹ The Cambridge History of India, page 322, says that the choice of Qaiṣar Khān shows "either ignorance and folly of the king, or the treachery of the nobles, for Qaiṣar Khān was Latif's principal adherent." This may be correct, but I have not seen anything anywhere in support of this statement.

² The word is *مستور* in both MSS and in the lith. ed. Firishtah who, as usual, copies a great deal from the Tabaqāt has the word *مستور* here instead of *مستور*.

³ The word is *اطفال*, minor sons, and as a matter of fact only Nasir Khān

⁴ In the account of the dream in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 308), Shāh 'Ālam and Shēkh Jīū are the only two mentioned, and Sultān Muzaffar is

Jalal Bukhari and Shah Ālam and a number of other Shaikhs. Sultan Muzaffar was also in attendance on them. Sultan Muzaffar was saying: Son Sikandar rise from the throne. Shaikh Ili was also saying: Rise. It is not your place. Bahadur Shah is the heir to the throne. When he awoke Sultan Sikandar immediately sent for a man and reported to him what he had seen in the dream. He became very agitated on account of the dream and in order to keep his mind occupied mounted to go and play *chaugān*. The fact of the dream became known to some people. After a *pas* or *pahar* he went to the palace and had some food and went to rest. As the *amirs* and the Sultan's particular attendants went to their houses. Imad ul mulk with some of the men of that group (i.e. those who had told him that the Sultan wanted to put him to death) and two of Sultan Muzaffar's slaves and another *Habshi* slave went to the palace. This was on the 19th Sha'ban 932 A.H. (May 30th O.S. and April 12th N.S. A.D. 1526).

Imād ul mulk¹ said to the men who were with him: Look at this palace for it is one of the 2 wonders of the age. When they arrived on the bank of the reservoir they met Nasrat ul mulk and Ibrahim son of Jauhar who were there. They at once drew their swords from the scabbards and rushed towards them. Nasrat ul mulk and Ibrahim also placed their hands on their swords but the wounds inflicted by them were of no avail and they were both slain. From that place the assassins went to Sultan Sikandar's bed chamber. Sa'id ul mulk was seated before the bed and was keeping

said to have declared. Surely it is not fated that Sikandar Khān should descend from the throne but Shaikh Ili said: Yes it is even so.

¹ The story has a flavour of unreality. The men had surely seen the palace before but Firishtah says the same thing and he agrees generally as to the incidents of the day on which Sultan Sikandar was murdered. Col Brigg (vol IV p. 100) gives the name of Baha'ool Moolk, Dar'ool Moolk and Saif Khan as the men who accompanied Imad'ool Moolk. Besides the two Turki slaves and one Abyssinian and he says that Sikandar Shah awakened by the noise rushed out to ascertain its cause when the assassin put him to death. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* (Bayley p. 311) has a somewhat different account but I need not repeat it here. According to it the Sultan was actually murdered by one Bahadur or Bahadar as Bayley transliterates the name.

² One MS. inserts *عرب* after *عصاب*.

guard When suddenly those men rushed in, the Saiyid on seeing what was happening, became agitated, but placed his hand on his sword and wounded two men, but he himself became a martyr. The assassins then inflicted two or three wounds on Sultān Sikandar, while he was still on the bed. The Sultān, the victim of these attacks, in great fear and alarm jumped up from the bed and stood on the ground, when one of them smote him with the sword of ¹ cruelty, and made a martyr of him. His rule lasted for ² two months and sixteen days.

³ AN ACCOUNT OF NASIR KHĀN ENTITLED SULTĀN MAHMŪD, SON OF
SULTĀN MUZAFFAR

As Sultān Sikandar became a martyr, 'Imād-ul-mulk in concert with Bahā'-ul-mulk forthwith brought Naṣir Khān out of the harem, and placing him on the throne gave him the title of Sultān Mahmūd. The *amīrs* of Sultān Sikandar fled (on account of their suspicions and fears) in different directions, and their houses were plundered and sacked. The martyr Sultān's body was sent to *mauda'* Halōl, one of the dependencies of Chāmpānīr, and was deposited in the earth. The *amīrs* and the chief men of Gujrāt had to come out of necessity to offer their congratulations. 'Imād-ul-mulk in accordance with the customary law gave royal robes of honour to the *amīrs* and the great men, and comforted them, and also conferred titles. Titles

¹ The words appear to be *شیر سیکے* and *سیکے* in the MS. The second word appears to be *سستگی*, hardship or cruelty.

² The MSS have two months and sixteen days. The lith ed has ten months. Firishtah lith ed does not mention the period, but Col Briggs has three months and seventeen days, from Jumadool-Awul 3rd to Shaban 19th. The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* (Bayley, p 317) makes it only one month and sixteen days from the 28th Jamādī-ul-ākhir to Sha'bān 14th, but Bayley says in a note that some MSS and the *Tārīkh i-Alfi* make it two months and sixteen days, but it appears that, according to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* itself, Bayley, page 281, Sultān Muzaffar died on the 2nd and not on the 28th Jamādī-ul-ākhir, and that Sultān Sikandar was assassinated on the 19th Sha'bān, two months and sixteen days was the correct period.

³ The heading I adopted is that in both the MSS. In the lith ed it is *دکتر سلطنت سلطان محمود المکمل ، سلطان محمود ہمار*, which is quite incorrect.

were conferred on one hundred and eighty one persons but the stipends and emoluments of the *amirs* were not increased. Most people waited for the arrival of Sultan Bahadur and made every effort by sending messages and emissaries to summon him. They were angry at the leadership and eminence of Imad ul mulk who had been one of the Sultan's slaves and did not lower their heads in obedience and submission to him. Khudawand Khan and Taj Khan more specially sought to be ahead of the others in this matter. Imad ul mulk on account of his ancient and recent enmity attempted to injure them. Taj Khan having put the girdle of endeavour and energy on his loins advanced with a well equipped army drawn from his own caste and tribesmen to bring back Sultan Bahadur. Imad ul mulk in great distress wrote a letter to Nizam ul mulk Dakini sent him much money and summoned him to come to the boundary of Sultampur and Nadarbar. He also wrote a letter to the Raja of Mal and summoned him to the border of Champainr and the Raja on account of his being in the vicinity collected his forces and came to the neighbourhood of Champainr. (Imad ul mulk also) owing to his great caution and far sightedness sent a petition to His Majesty Firdus Makani¹ Babar Badshah to the effect that if he would send one of his many powerful armies he would prevent the

¹ The whole of the sentence from *اوردند* to *وارسری* is omitted from one of the MSS. It is also omitted in the text edition.

Firishtah says that Nizam ul mulk kept the *نکاح* but passed the time with negligence. Col Briggs (vol IV pp 101-10) has presents consisting of jewels and money. Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah the Mirat-i-Sikandar-i-Bayley page 318 says that Imad ul Mulk wrote to Imad ul Mulk Ihtisari to come to Sultampur and Nadarbar and wrote to Rana Sank and conciliated the neighbouring *amirs* and also wrote to Babar.

² See note ² page 314

³ One MS has Humayun Badshah here by mistake but a few lines further down it has Babar Badshah. Firishtah's account of the petition to Babar agrees generally with the text but he says that Imad ul mulk suggested that if one of Babar's army would come to Diphe (Imad ul mulk) would present a *kror* of *tankas* towards the expenses. Col Briggs explains this by saying that it was intended that Babur should send the force down the Indus to land at Diu and he adds that the letter to Babur never reached its destination having been intercepted by the ruler of Dongurpoor (vol IV p 10).

fort of Dip, and one *krōi* of *tankas* in cash towards the expenses of His Majesty's servants

The *thānadār* of Dūngarpūr, having received information that 'Imād-ul-mulk had sent a petition to Bābar Bādshāh, and had asked His Majesty to come to Gujrāt, sent a letter to Tāj Khān and Khudāwand Khān, and the *amīrs* of Gujrāt sent a man to Bahādur Shāh and summoned him ¹ The messenger sent by the *amīrs* waited upon Sultān Bahādur in the neighbourhood, and presented to him their petition Sultān Bahādur was sad and grieved at his father's death, and performed the mourning ceremony He gave Pāyinda Khān Afghān, who had come from Jaunpūr to take him there, permission to go back, and although the latter dilated (on the splendour) of the empire of the eastern country, and incited him to go there, he turned his face towards Ahmadābād They say, that men came at one and the same time from Jaunpūr and Gujrāt to summon him He said, he would leave the choice to his horse, in whichever direction he would take him The horse started towards Gujrāt When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Chitōr, soldiers arrived one after another from Gujrāt, and they brought the news of the assassination of Sultān Sikandar, and the accession of Nasir Khān Sultān Bahādur was pained to hear of it, and starting from there encamped at Chitōr There Chānd Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān, sons of Sultān Muzaffar, came to him He was pleased and delighted at meeting his brothers Chānd Khān took leave of him and remained at Chitōr, but Ibrāhīm Khān chose the service of his brother, and accompanied him In a short time after passing Chitōr, ² Uday Singh, Rāja of Māl, and some adherents

¹ The account in *Firishtah* agrees generally with that in the text, only he calls Pāyinda Khān Afghān Pābind Khān, and says he came from the Afghāns of Jaunpūr He is also clearer about Bahādur's leaving the choice between Gujrāt and Jaunpūr to his horse According to him Bahādur said, he would ride out, and then let go the reins As to Chānd Khān and Ibrāhīm Khān, he says they were with Rānā Sānkā, being probably fugitives from Gujrāt Col Briggs (vol IV, p 102) says that Chand Khan and Ibrahim Khan first gave Bahadur the news of the assassination of Sultan Sikundur, and he also says clearly that they had fled to the Rana after that event

² *Firishtah* lith ed here calls Uday Singh, Rāja of Mālpūr, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 102) has Raja Oody Sing of Poloh as before

of Sikandar such as Malik Sarwar and Malik Yusuf and Latif and others came and entered Sultan Bahadur's service

Sultan Bahadur sent Malik Taj Jamal with a *farman* conveying assurances of his favour to Taj Khan and the other *amirs* and gave them news of his ¹ approach. Taj Khan on seeing the letter advanced from Danduka with a great force to join the service of Sultan Bahadur and he bade farewell to Latif Khan son of Muzaffar after giving him a sum of money to pay his expenses (telling him) now that the heir of Muzaffar's and Mahmud's kingdom had arrived it was not advisable that he should remain there. Latif Khan with a heart which was frying and with eyes which were shedding tears went as a suppliant to Fath Khan who was a cousin (uncle's son) of Sultan Bahadur. When the Sultan arrived at Dungarpur Khurram Khan and other Khans hastened to welcome him and the *amirs* and *ardars* of all the provinces turned their faces towards him. Imad ul mulk on hearing this news and being deserted by these adherents began to collect troops. He began to empty the treasury and sent a number of men with an army ready to fight and fifty elephants under the command of Add ul mulk to the town of Mahrasa so that they might on their arrival there close the roads to the coming and going of the people and ² permit no one to go to Sultan Bahadur. When Sultan Bahadur arrived in the town of Mahmudabad the *amirs* who had joined Sikandar and who had fled for fear of their lives came and obtained the honour of the service (of Sultan Bahadur). The men who were with Add ul mulk fled from Mahrasa. On the following morning when

¹ The word حود is omitted in one MS.

It would appear that Shihzida Iatif Khan was with Taj Khan and this is stated expressly by Firishtah as he says کہ میرٹ: سیکنداری بایں: page 36 says that when Bahādar came to Dungarpur Taj Khan left Dhandukah to wait upon him. Just then prince Iatif Khan arrived at Dhandukah and solicited the help of Taj Khan offering to place the administration of the country to his hands. Taj Khan told him that he had already promised his support to Sultan Bahadur.

² There is a difference in the readings here. One MS. has کہ کسی بیس سلطان بہادر. The other omits the word Sultan. The lith. ed. has کہ کسی بہادر. I have adopted the first reading which is also the reading in the lith. ed. of Firishtah but he substitutes Shihzida for Sultan.

the Sultān arrived at Mahrāsa, Tāj Khān, with the royal umbrella and the other insignia of royalty, came and saw the Sultān, and the latter with great pomp and power encamped in the city of Nahrwāla ¹ Pattan on the 26th of the auspicious month of Ramadān in the year 932 A H, August 15th N S, 1526 A D. From that place he advanced towards Ahmadābād after ² assuming the insignia of royalty. On the 22nd of the month, he performed the pilgrimage to the tombs of the great Shaikh̄s and his royal ancestors, and then entered Ahmadābād.

'Imād-ul-mulk in his agitation and confusion paid a ³ year's wages to the soldiers in advance, and incited them to fight. ⁴ Sultān Bahādur had after three or four days left Ahmadābād with great pomp and splendour. During this interval most of the *amīrs*, after taking much money from 'Imād-ul-mulk, joined the Sultān. ⁵ Bahā'-ul-mulk and Dāwar-ul-mulk who were the actual murderers of Sultān Sikandar sought for a disagreement with 'Imād-ul-mulk, and joined the Sultān's service. The latter, considering it desirable in the cir-

¹ The word پٹن Pattan is left out in one MS.

² The word is اعلان in both MSS, اعلام in the lith ed, and in the lith ed of Firishtah. The 26th of Ramadan 932 A H corresponds to August 3rd, 1526 A D, according to Col Briggs and August (without any date) 1526 A D according to Bayley. Col Briggs's date is according to the old style. The date of the assumption of the royalty would accordingly be 15th of August (N S), 1526 A D, and the place Nahrwāla. The Cambridge History of India, page 323, gives the 11th July, 1526, and Ahmadābād as the date and place respectively of the accession.

³ One MS has رر يكساله, the other has only يكساله. The lith ed has مواجب يكساله. Firishtah also has مواجب يكساله. I have, therefore, retained the reading in the lith ed. Firishtah adds that 'Imād-ul-mulk also sent an emissary to Shāhzāda Latīf Khān, so that he might with the latter's aid be able to fight with Sultān Bahādur.

⁴ This sentence is not in the lith ed but is in both MSS. There is, however, a slight difference between the two readings. One MS has با آمد آباد while the other has ار آمد آباد. I think the latter is correct. It appears from Firishtah that he went from Ahmadābād to Muhammadābād, and بر آمده means leaving and not entering.

⁵ Baha ool Moolk and Dar ool Moolk were mentioned by Col Briggs as two of the men who attacked and killed Sikandar Shah. See note 1, page 327.

circumstances of the time tried to please them and endeavoured to comfort (their?) hearts. The period of the rule of Sultan Mahmud Nasir Khan did not exceed four months.

1 AN ACCOUNT OF THE ACCESSION OF SULTĀN BAHĀDUR SHĀH

As the day of the Id 1 Ramadan of the year 932 A H was according to the selection of astrologers fixed as the time of the accession of Sultan Bahadur he sat on the throne of his great ancestors (on that day) by the exertions of the *amirs* and the great men of the country and raised the standard of empire. The rites of making offerings of loyalty and of wax offering were carried out and (the hearts) of the *amirs* and of the great ² men and of the commanders of the army were gladdened by increases in their stipends and by addition to their titles and by grants of money and horses and robes of honour.

In the beginning of Shawwal he moved from that place and advanced towards Chumpanir. At the first stage of the journey Mu'azzam Khan with a number of other respected leaders hastened to wait on him and received favours and kindness. When he started from that station on the way he ⁴ conferred the title of Shams ul mulk on Nuh

¹ The heading I have in the text is the heading in both the MSS. with the difference that one has *Shah* at the end and the other omits it. The heading in the lith. ed. is *دگر سلطنت سلطان بہادر بن سلطان مظفر*. This is in the like the heading of other reigns.

According to the *Mirat-i Sikandari* Bayley page 37 Bahadur Shah assumed the royal insignia at Nahrwala on the 14th Ramazan 932 A H August 16 6 and the formal accession took place at Ahmadabad. Col Briggs (vol IV p 103) says he was formally crowned at Nahrwala on the 14th Ramazan 932 A H August 3rd 15 6 A H. The Cambridge History of India page 333 says he ascended the throne on July the 11th 15 6 at Ahmadabad.

² The words *واعلیٰ* are not to be found in one MS.

⁴ There is a difference of readings here. One MS. has the reading I have accepted. The other MS. and the lith. ed. have *نوح بن يوسف ملک و حسن بن سيف الملك را سمن الملك خطاب داد*. Apparently there is some mistake for one title could hardly be conferred on two persons. I have consulted Firishtah and the *Mirat-i Sikandari* but have not received any help from either. There is no mention of the fact in either. Firishtah after mentioning the arrival of Muzaffar Khan goes on to say that the *بارک* river Butrak was in such flood etc. The *Mirat-i Sikandari* Bayley page 331 at once takes Sultan Bahadur to the

bin Yūsuf-ul-mulk, and when news came that the river of Bātrak was in such flood, that it was critical to cross it, Sultān Bahādur halted at the town of ¹ Sahvunj, and left Tāj Khān on the bank of the river, that he might send the army over in different bodies one after another. The next day a number of the *amīrs* of Chāmpānī, who had taken their ² salaries from the treasury, came and joined him. Sultān Bahādur owing to the nobility of his spirit made a present of that ³ money to them. When Sultān Bahādur arrived at the bank of the river Mahindrī, at the fort of Khānpūr, his army commenced to cross over.

Imād-ul-mulk sent men towards Barōda and in other directions, so that they might raise the dust of rebellion and keep the Sultān occupied with it. But the latter rapidly crossed the river, and advanced towards Chāmpānīr. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city, Dīā'-ul-mulk, son of Nasīr Khān, ⁴ came and saw him. The

Mahindrī Bayley in a note on that page says that the *Tabakāt-i Akbarī* is rather fuller at this place, and makes a quotation from it, but the grant of the title on Nūh *bin* Yūsuf ul mulk or on Husain *bin* Saif-ul mulk is not mentioned in it. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 105) does not mention the Bātrak, but says that Bahadur Shah was compelled to halt at the Saburmutty on account of the heavy rain, from which one might infer that the Bātrak is probably another name of the Saburmutty. Bayley in the quotation from the *Tabakāt* calls it the Wātrak.

¹ The name is written as سهونج in both MSS and سهونج in the lith ed and سونج in the lith ed of Firishtah.

² The word is ماعیانه in one MS and in the lith ed. It is مالها in the other MS and also in the lith ed of Firishtah. I have not before this seen the word ماعیانه in respect of the stipends of *amīrs* and soldiers. The word ordinarily in use is علوفه. It is not clear in what way the *amīrs* had taken the *mahīāna* or *māl*, but it may be inferred from what he says in the next sentence, that there was something reprehensible or wrong about it.

³ The lith ed adds بربان بیاورد but neither the MSS nor the corresponding sentence in Firishtah have those or any similar words.

⁴ One MS has آمده دید. The other has امر سلطان باو دید. The word دید has evidently been misplaced from before سلطان to after باو, and آمده has been written امر. The lith ed has only آمد. The account given in the *Mirāt-i Sikandari* (Bayley, p 331) is different. It does not mention Dīā-ul-mulk at all, but says the Sultān crossed the river with four hundred horsemen and some elephants, before the rest of the army, and sent Tāj Khān with three hundred

Sultān told him Go in advance and convey this order to your father that he should surround the house of Imad ul mulk and seize him He also sent Taj Khan very quickly with some other Khans to attack Imad ul mulk and he also himself mounted to follow him Taj Khan went with great quickness and surrounded Imad ul mulk's house The latter threw himself from the wall of the house and took shelter in the house of Shah Jiu Sadiqi His house was pillaged and his sons taken prisoner It so happened that Sultān Bahadur crossed in front of the house of Khudawand Khan The latter came out of his house and rendered homage After that his slaves seized Imad ul mulk and brought him before the Sultān The latter ordered that Imad ul mulk and Saif ul din and the other murderers of Sultān Sikandar should be hanged The title of Imad ul mulk was conferred on Rasi ul mulk son of Malik Tuakil who was one of the Muzaffar Shahi slaves and he was made the *Irād-i Mumalik* (the head *munshi* of the kingdom)

Add ul mulk fled from Baroda but on the way the kols plundered all his equipage and things Sultān Bahadur appointed Shamsher ul mulk to seize Add ul mulk and he appointed Nizam ul mulk to attack Mubāfiz Khan The rebels fled and sought the protec-

horsemen in advance to seize Imad ul Mulik Of course the *Tal asq t al i* says that Taj Khan was sent later to attack Imad ul mulk

¹ One MS has گنر کرد which I think would be better; but as the other MS the lith ed and the lith ed of *Imritah* all have عبر کرد I have retained it

² It appears from *Imritah* that he was seized in the house of *سید حنوی* who according to the *Mirāt-i Sikandari* Bayl's page 33 was not the man that had cursed Sultān Sikandar but was the head keeper of the *dār-dān*

³ Col Briggs (vol IV p 105) says that Imad ul Moolk's sons as also executed but this does not appear anywhere else The actual words about the mode of punishment in *Imritah* are سر را ناحیان پای رنده پوست کندید As regards Imad ul mulk however Mir Abu Turab says on page 3 of his *Tarikh-i Gujarāt* that در میدان دربار در میان نارار سر را ناحیان پای رنده پوست کندید i.e. in the plain of the *darbar* in the *baṭr* his skin was flayed while he was still living from his head to the nails of his toes

⁴ *Imritah* lith ed agrees generally with the text but Col Briggs (vol IV p 106) says that the fugitives sought refuge with Oodiy Singh Raja of Ichh This partly agrees with the *Mirāt-i Sikandari* which says that Add ul mulk and Mubāfiz Khan fled to the hill country of Lal Bayl's page 333

tion of Rāy Singh, and the troops sent against them ¹ returned after plundering their goods and chattels. After two or three days news was brought that ² the son of 'Aiz-ul-mulk and Shāh Jīū Sadīqī and a number of the murderers of Sikandar Shāh had been slain in the house of Qadī Khān. ³ Bahā'-ul-mulk taking advantage of an opportunity fled from Chāmpānīr. On the way, the *shahna* (police superintendent) of Dēhī seized him, and brought him before the Sultān. As he had inflicted a wound on Sultān Sikandar, and the wound which ⁴ 'Ism-ud-dīn had inflicted on him was still fresh (*i.e.*, unhealed), Sultān Bahādur ordered that he should be flayed, and then hanged. The three other men, who were among the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, were all (to use the quaint phraseology of the original) placed at the mouth of the cannon and sent into the air, or as one would say in ordinary language blown up at the mouths of cannon. In short, in a little while, all the murderers of Sultān Sikandar were put to death with great torture.

It so happened that on the day on which Sultān Bahādur entered Chāmpānīr, Latīf Khān, son of Muzaffar Shāh, at the instigation of (some) *amīns*, also came to the city and for some days remained concealed there. Qaiṣar Khān and Alf Khān and some other *amīns* sent a message to ⁵ Latīf Khān that it was not fitting that he should remain there any longer and he should in any case ⁶ conceal himself in some other corner. He became hopeless and scratching the ⁷ back of his

¹ One MS has *مراحت نمود* instead of *مراحت نمود*.

² The MSS have what I have got in the text. The lith. ed. agrees, with this difference that it has *عرص الملك* instead of *عرص الملك*. The lith. ed. of Firishtah has *سر عصد الملك*. This appears to be correct. No person of the name of *عرص الملك* is mentioned anywhere else.

³ He was one of the murderers of Sultān Sikandar, whose services Sultān Bahādur had at first thought it advisable to accept, but who, now according to Firishtah, became doubtful of his safety and fled. See also note 5, page 332.

⁴ One MS has *عالم الدين*.

⁵ One MS omits the Khān after Latīf.

⁶ The words are *ناید برساند* in one MS and in the lith. ed. They are *ناید رساند* in the other MS. I have accepted the latter, as it is more correct grammatically.

⁷ The word *نس* is not to be found in one MS and in the lith. ed., but is in the other MS, and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I have retained it, as

head ¹ went to the country of Māl The Rājā of Māl did not show any favour to him Add ul mulk and Muhafiz Khan then joined him and they went from there to Munka and there they passed the time in wandering about in the hilly country

In short Sultān Bahadur now commenced to attend to the welfare of the *raiyats* and of the soldiery and made all the people and all sections of the community participators in his boundless largesses He increased the stipends of the soldiers generally by ³ ten twenties and ten forties and gave them one year's wages and made them contented and thankful He also gave to the *faqirs* who lived round the tombs in Sirkhej and Bātuh and Risulabad happy by giving them stipends and allowances

it is the back of the head that one scratches when in a quandary نس سرخارندن
appears to be a Persian idiom

¹ Firishtah lith ed says that Latif Khan went to the country of Māl but does not say what happened to him there or whether he afterwards joined Add ul mulk and Muhafiz Khan Col Briggs says he went to Poloh The Mirat i Sikandari (Bayley p 333) does not appear to mention the fact that Latif Khan came to Champānār and remained concealed there but says Azd ul mull and Muhafiz Khan fled to the country of Pāl and joined Latif Khan The Cambridge History of India page 33 says he fled to Palanpur

The name is موگا in the MSS and in the lith ed The lith ed of Firishtah has موگا Col Briggs says vol IV page 106 that Azd ool Mulk and Mohafi Khan fled to Mutwar and in a note on the same page he gives the boundaries of Mutwar as between the Verbudla and Tapti rivers N and S and Little Ood poor and Choly Maheswur E and W The Mirat i Sikandari does not give the name of the place but Bayley in a note on page 334 in which he refers to the Tabakat says that Latif Khan fled to the hill country of Bonga

³ The meaning is not quite clear it apparently means doubled and quadrupled but this is not likely Firishtah lith ed inserts a دے سی between دے نسب and دے حبل This would be 300 per cent None of the translations refers to this The Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 333 says that The Sultan now opened the hand of bounty and like a cloud rained down gold and jewels and allowances and favours all round but there is no mention of the proportion by which the wages of the soldiers were increased It appears from page 334 however in connection with the allowances to Ghazi Khan that دے نسب does mean twofold and consequently دے سی and دے حبل also mean twofold and fourfold

¹ And as at that time, the fort of Chāmpānī was the capital of Gujrāt, and the Sultāns ascended the throne there, he on the 15th of Dhī-qa'dah, at the moment chosen by the astrologers, adorned and decorated a jewelled throne, inlaid with gems, in the manner of the old Sultāns near the eastern *darbār*, and on the date previously mentioned, which was in the year 932 A H, he placed the crown on his head, and according to the custom of his ancestors, sat on the throne. The great men and the *Shaykhs* and the *amīrs* and the *Khāns* spoke words of congratulations, and carried out the ceremonies of making loyal offerings and wave offerings. On that day, a thousand persons had the distinction of robes of honour being conferred on them, and a number of people were honoured by the grant of titles. ² Ghāzī Khān was then appointed to the government of Nadarbār and Sultānpūr, and although his allowances had been increased by ten-twenty (i.e., double) at the accession at Ahmadābād, it was again doubled now.

At this time ³ news came that Latīf Khān had, at the instigation of 'Add-ul-mulk and Muhāfiz Khān, gone to the hills of ⁴ Āwās in the vicinity of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, with the intention of creating a disturbance and raising a revolt. Sultān Bahādūr ordered that an army should be sent, which would in co-operation with Ghāzī Khān crush and destroy him. ⁵ At this time, the date of the accession on

¹ This second coronation is mentioned by Firishtah lith. ed. and very briefly by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106). The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* (Bayley, p. 334) also mentions it briefly after mentioning the famine.

² It appears from the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, page 334, that the Sultān ordered Tāj Khān to command the army against Latīf Khān and his adherents; but Tāj Khān represented that Ghāzī Khān son of Ahmad Khān was the best man for the work, and the latter was then appointed to the *sūbah* of Nandarbār.

³ According to the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, page 333, the famine occurred before the receipt of the news of Latīf Khān's revolt, and the appointment of Ghāzī Khān, or at least the famine is mentioned there before the revolt.

⁴ The place is so named in the MSS., in the lith. ed., and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 106) calls it the Ahwas hills. They do not appear to be mentioned in the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*.

⁵ The MSS. and the lith. ed. have the text as I have it, but in the corresponding passage of Firishtah there is the word چون before, and the word ای after the word مقارن. This is, I think, a better reading. The date of the accession on the 'Id-ul-duha was the anniversary of the accession at Ahmadābād which took place on that day.

the *Id ud duha* arrived. On this day the Sultan arranged a grand festive assembly and again bestowed on many of the *amirs* robes and belts and daggers and swords and in this way made them pleased with him.

It so happened that at this time a famine took place and (the Sultan) ordered Hushiyar ul mulk who was the treasurer to attend at his stirrups so that at the time when he was riding he should give a ¹ *Mu affari* to everyone who should ask for help. The Sultan rode out every day twice to play *chaugan* and in every city many alms houses were established for *faqirs* and poor people and the Sultan endeavoured with all his energy to ameliorate the condition of the *raiyats* so that in a short time a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the country of Gujrat.

A considerable time had not yet elapsed when the men who had been creating disturbances began to move again. Shuja ul mulk fled and joined Latif Khan and Qaisar Khan who was one of the great *amirs* of Muzaffar Shah sent a number of his retainers with him. As Qaisar Khan and ³ Ulugh Khan had been in agreement with Imad ul mulk in the matter of the murder of Sultan Sikandar and were afraid of suffering the punishments for their acts they did not abandon their hostile attitude. The loyal *amirs* having come to know of this informed the Sultan. ⁴ The latter sent Ulugh Khan with a well

¹ The *Mirat i Sikandar* Bayley page 333 says a gold *ashrafi*. The Sultan riding out to play *chaugan* is mentioned in this connection. I suppose to indicate that the *Mu-affaris* were given away on these occasions.

The wording in the MS and in the lith ed which همگی در برتبه appears to be defective. Either there should be the preposition *be* before همگی or the words همگی should be omitted. These words are omitted in the corresponding sentence in the lith ed of Firsihtah.

³ One MS and Firsihtah lith ed and Col Briggs and the *Mirat i Sikandar* have الع حال so I have taken that name though the other MS and the lith ed have الف حال.

⁴ There is apparently some misstatement in the sequence of events. Apparently Ulugh Khan had already been sent in command of the army sent against Latif Khan when the loyal *amirs* made the representation in the matter but the difficulty is that it is said that Qaisar Khan and Ulugh Khan were put into prison. Probably Ulugh Khan was recalled or he had not started although the troops he was to command had. The *Mirat i Sikandar* Bayley page 33.

equipped army against Latif Khān. Some of the loyal adherents of the Sultān represented to him, that as Qaisar Khān and Ulugh Khān had combined with 'Imād-ul-mulk in the murder of Sultān Sikandar, and now they were again awakening the rebellion, which had fallen asleep, by sending letters, etc., it was not right that they should be in that neighbourhood. The Sultān was considering this matter, when news came to Tāj Khān that Ulugh Khān and Qaisar Khān had summoned Latif Khān to Nādōt by a road which was not well known and they were about to join him. Tāj Khān reported all this to the Sultān in private, and took an oath on the word of God (*i.e.*, the *Qur'ān*) that there was no untruth in what he was saying. The next day, when the *amīrs*, according to daily custom, came to salute (the Sultān), Qaisar Khān and Ulugh Khān were put into prison. ¹ Dāwar-ul-mulk who had escaped by means of an excuse, was arrested. Dīā'-ul-mulk and Khwājah Bābū who were suspected of associating with the conspirators were also imprisoned, they were brought into the public audience hall, with their heads uncovered and their hands bound. The men of the city assembled in multitudes and plundered their houses. Dīā'-ul-mulk placed a robe round his neck, and made humble supplication, and Bābū agreed to pay ² fifty lakhs of *tanikas* as the ransom of blood. Sultān Bahādur gave up the idea of putting them to death and ordered them to be released. His kingdom was now purified from the weeds of disturbance and rebellion.

In the beginning of the year 933 A.H., 1527 A.D., a body of *silāhdārs* (troopers), whose numbers reached ³ ten thousand, made a

says that Qaisar Khān and 'Ulugh Khān and Dāwar ul Mulk were all ordered to be beheaded. Bayley in a note says that Firishtah says that 'Ulugh Khān's innocence was established. Firishtah nowhere, as far as I can see, says so. Like the author of the *Tabaqāt* Firishtah only says that Qaisar Khān and Ulugh Khān were put into prison, but does not say anything about what happened to them later.

¹ The name is written as *دوار الملك* and *فرار الملك* in the MS., and *داور الملك* in the lith. ed.

² One MS. has here by mistake *سبحارة* helpless, as an adjective to Bābū instead of *سبحة* fifty.

³ The number is ten thousand in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. But Firishtah lith. ed. has two thousand. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 107) makes it a large party headed by nearly two thousand officers. According to Firishtah they

complaint on a Friday that they had not received their allowances and did not allow the *Khutba* to be read. Sultān Bahādur excused the offence on account of his innate forbearance and ordered the payment of their allowances. These men had intended to go to Latif *Khan* and they had also instigated others to do so.

At this time a petition came from Chazī *Khan* to the effect that Latif *Khan* has come to Sultānpur with a large force and has raised the standard of hostility. I went and met him and after the battle Add ul mulk and Muhafiz *Khan* fled and Ray Bhīm with his brothers fell on the battlefield and Latif *Khan* was wounded and taken prisoner. Sultān Bahādur immediately on hearing this news sent Muhib ul mulk and a body of other *amirs* so that they might properly and kindly attend to the condition of Latif *Khan* and bring him to his presence after placing ointments on his wounds but as he was mortally wounded he died on the way. He was buried in the village of Halol one of the dependencies of Champānir by the side of Sultān Sikandar. In the course of the same year ¹ Nāsir *Khan* who had received the title of Sultān Mahmud also died. The Sultān appointed a number of beadsmen (*وطلبه دار*) at his brothers tombs and ordered the daily distribution of cooked and uncooked food there.

In the same year also news came that Ray Singh Rāj of Mal on hearing of the execution of Qaisar *Khan* sought an opportunity

made their complaint in the *Jama Masjid* and this is also indicated by the fact mentioned in the text that they prevented the reader of the public prayers to read them. Firishtah also does not attribute the act of the Sultān to his forbearance but says he knew they intended to go over to Latif *Khan* and therefore ordered their allowances to be paid as a matter of policy. Their intention of going over to Latif *Khan* is also mentioned in the text.

¹ This was a young king who was placed on the throne by Imad ul mulk after the murder of Sultān Sikandar. The Cambridge History of India page 33 says that he was secretly put to death but I do not know the authority on which this statement is made. Neither the *Tabaqat* nor *Firistah* nor the *Mirāt-i Sikandari* says so though it is quite possible that the young prince was secretly murdered.

The reason of the hostility of Ray Singh on hearing the news of the execution of Qaisar *Khan* and of his invading the Sultān's dominion and of sacking the town of Dahud is not at all clear nor is it clear why Ray Singh should have seized a lot of the properties of Dīa ul mull the son of Qaisar *Khan*. The Cambridge History of India page 393 says that it was the murder of the

and sacked the town of ¹Dahūd, and much property belonging to Dīā'-ul-mulk, son of Qaisar Khān fell into his hands. The Sultān on hearing this news became anxious, and wanted to advance in person. Tāj Khān, however, submitted to him, that at the beginning of a reign, many occurrences like this take place, and His Majesty should not at all allow any distress or pain to lodge in his heart. If this slave is commanded to undertake this service, he would with the divine favour and the auspiciousness of His Majesty's attention, chastise that turbulent man, the Rāja of Māl, as he deserves. The Sultān immediately conferred a robe of honour on him, and sent one *lal'h* of horsemen with him for the punishment of Rāy Singh, the Rāja of Māl. Tāj Khān

child Mahmūd II, that alienated Udai Singh of Pālanpur, or as he is described in the text and in Firishtah, of Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl. But it is not clear why this Hindū chief should have taken the murder of the young Musalmān prince so much to heart as to put his country into such danger by raiding the territory of the powerful Sultān of Gujrāt. The text both of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah make it clear that it was on hearing of the execution of Qaisar Khān, *قتل و مړ*, *خان* that he sought an opportunity and sacked Dahūd. In respect of Nasir Khān both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah had used the word, *وفات*, death. So that when they speak of the *قتل و مړ خان*, the name *فيمر خان* cannot be a mistake for *نصير خان*. The Mirāt-i Sikandari, Bayley, page 335, does not directly connect the raid by Rāi Singh of Pāl, as he is called there, either with the execution of Kaisar Khān or the death of Nasir Khān but it connects it indirectly with the former and not in any way with the latter. The Mirāt-i Sikandari does not mention the fact of the property of Ziā ul-mulk being taken in the text, but Bayley in a note on page 336 quoting from the Tabakāt says that Rāi Singh "made his attack on hearing of the execution of Kaisar Khān, apparently because he supposed that that showed disunion in Bahādar Shāh's camp." This is not a very cogent reason, but I mention it for what it is worth. Later on in the same note Bayley calls Ziā ul mulk, the son of Nasir Khān, and that Rāi Singh's son afterwards came in and submitted and was honoured with a dress (*Khil'at*). Both these statements appear to me to be incorrect. The Tabaqāt and Firishtah both calls Dīā ul mulk, the son of Qaisar Khān. There is no Nasir Khān mentioned anywhere, about this time except the young prince, who certainly had no sons. As to the visit of Rāy Singh's son to the Sultān, it will be seen from the text that it was Rānā Sānkā's son and not Rāy Singh's, who came and paid a visit to the Sultān. The lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, however, says that it was Rāy Singh's son. Probably Bayley had some MS. before him, that also said so.

¹ *دهور* in the text

¹ invaded the country of Mal and began to devastate it. Rāj Singh then with great humility and distress submitted a petition for the pardon of his offences through the intervention of Sharf ul mulk who was one of Sultān Muzaffar's *amirs*. It did not however meet with acceptance and Taj Khan penetrated into the country and stretched his hands to plunder and ravage it and did not leave any thing undone in devastating it. Rāj Singh chose a difficult position and prepared to fight there and Taj Khan standing firm and strong met him. A large number of active and strong men were killed on the side of Rāj Singh and only one man was killed on the side of the Muslims. Taj Khan remained one month in the country of Mal after which he hastened to the service of the Sultān.

In the month of Rabi' ul awwal of the same year Sultān Bahadur left his capital with the object of hunting. At this time a number of the *raiyats* of Kanbayet came and made complaint of the acts of the officer in charge of the town. The Sultān sent Taj Khan to arrange the affairs of that neighbourhood and issued an order for the dismissal of the *darogha* of Kanbayet. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Champaur the son of Rana Sanka came to render homage and after staying there for some days and after being made happy by favours and kindness received permission to leave.

In the year 934 A.H. 1528 A.D. the Sultān cast the shadow of conquest over the countries of Idar and Bakar and having in a short time conquered those countries returned to Champaur. He then went with a small retinue to rebuild the fort of Bahroj and after

¹ There is a little difference in the readings. One MS. has در آمدہ بنیاد *dar āmda bniyād* e having invaded the country began to devastate it. The other has only در آمد *dar āmd* e invaded the country. The lith. ed. has در آمد *dar āmd* e I have adopted the first reading as it gives reason for Rāj Singh's humility. Firishtah also has the same reading.

This is somewhat curious but Firishtah also says وارہ اہل ربادہ ار *warah ahl rabādah ar* e of the Muslims more than one man was not killed. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 108) also says the same thing but he describes it as a remarkable fact and he says only one man of Taj Khan's army is said to have fallen. The Mirat-i-Sikandarī also says the same thing and says that the man who was killed was named Muḥamad Ḥasan (Bayley p. 336). M. Hidavat Hosain has adopted ک سو نفر بقتل آمد *k su nafa b qatl āmd* e in the text edition.

finishing his work there, went to Kanbāyet. One day, when he was amusing himself on the coast, a ship happened to arrive from the port Dīp. The men, who came in it, reported, that a ship belonging to the *fiangīs* had been cast ashore by the wind. Qawām-ul-mulk had seized the property on board the ship, and was ¹ causing the *fiangīs* the hardship of being made slaves. On hearing this news after breaking his ² fast the Sultān travelled to Dīp by road. Qawām-ul-mulk hastened to meet him, and produced the *fiangīs* before him. He invited them to accept Islām, and having made a large number of them Musalmāns, raised the standard of return.

In the same year ³ a letter came from 'Ādil Khān, governor of Āsir, who was a nephew (sister's son) of Sultān Bahādur, the purport

¹ The meaning of the words which are بدلتا مکتلا دارد in the MSS (though the word بدلت is written as بدلت in one of them) is not quite clear but I suppose my translation is correct. Firishtah has the word بدیل instead of بدلت. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 109) says the crew had been made prisoners.

² The word is افطار in both MSS and افطار in the lith ed. Firishtah says the Sultān became very pleased on hearing the news, and agrees generally as to the facts of the incidents, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 109) says in the text that all the Europeans taken on this occasion were circumcised and became Mahomedans, but in a note he says that "The Portuguese historian states that they resisted being converted and were eventually released. James de Mesquita was the name of the officer, and his whole crew consisted of only sixteen men in a boat. It is certain that James de Mesquita was with Bahādur Shah afterwards, at the siege of Chittoor, and was employed by him as his envoy to Nuno de Cunha in the year that Bahādur Shah lost his life." This incident does not appear to be mentioned in either the Mirāt-i Sikandarī or the Cambridge History of India.

³ The tenor of the letter is rather vague and disjointed. Firishtah lith ed agrees generally but the names of the party are somewhat different. 'Ādil Khān is called Mirān Muhammad Shāh, Nizām ul mulk Bahrī Burhān Nizām Shāh Bahrī, Barīd Bīdarī Qāsim Barīd and 'Imād ul mulk, 'Alā ud dīn 'Imād Shāh, and instead of the three hundred elephants mentioned in the Tabaqāt, Firishtah says some elephants, چند سلسله دبل, were carried away as plunder. Col Briggs's account is similar to Firishtah, but he calls Mirān Muhammad Shāh "Meeran Mahomed Khan." The Mirāt-i Sikandarī, Bayley, page 340, generally agrees, but says that the confederacy against 'Imād ul-Mulk Gāwēlī or Mirān Muhammad Khān consisted of besides Nizām-ul Mulk and Barīd, Khudāwand Khān Pātharī, and 'Ain ul-Mulk and others, but it says nothing of the looting of the elephants and the taking of the fort of Māhūr, but Bayley mentions them

of which was this. As Imad ul mulk Kawil had prayed with humility for help from this *faqir* and Nizam ul mulk Bahri and ¹Malik Barid of Bidar had forcibly entered into the country Kawil the *faqir* went to help and reinforce Imad ul mulk and a great battle took place. The *faqir* drove away the men in front of him. Nizam ul mulk Bahri who was in ambush attacked and defeated Imad ul mulk and carried away as plunder three hundred elephants belonging to the *faqir*. The *faqir* has now come relying on the generosity of Your Majesty. Whatever noble order is issued by you will be entirely for the welfare of all and he (I suppose Nizam ul mulk Bahri) has violently taken possession of the fort of ²Mahur which is the greatest fort in Kawil. An order was issued to the following effect. Last year a petition came from Imad ul mulk and Malik An ul mulk the governor of Nahrwal in accordance with orders went and amicably settled the matter between the parties. Now that this violence has been perpetrated by Nizam ul mulk therefore in accordance with the saying—the offender is a tyrant—he is the tyrant and Imad ul mulk the victim of his oppression and it is a duty incumbent on the energy of all merciful people to help the oppressed. In the month of Muharram in the year 933 A.H. September 1325 A.D. the Sultan advanced with an immense army with the object of conquering the Deccan and encamped in the town of Baroda and a long time elapsed there for the mustering of the troops.

⁴ About the middle of that year 935 A.H. 1329 A.D. Jam Iruz the ruler of Thatha had to leave his country owing to the growing power of the Arghuns and came and joined Sultan Bahadur

in a foot note. The account of the Cambridge History of India page 34 is somewhat similar but it says in addition that the cause of the quarrel was the possession of the town and district of Pathri on the Godavari which belonged to the ruler of Berar by right but were coveted and had been annexed by that of Ahmadnagar (Alauddin Imad Shah).

¹ مدبر بدری in the text edition

The word is حالا in one MS but حالها in the other and in the lith ed.

² The word مکاشم in one MS

⁴ Frishtal's account agrees but he does not name the Arghuns but substitutes Maghul. Col Briggs (vol IV p 110) calls them Arghoon. Mruttilal Silarani does not mention the allowance of twelve *lakhs* of *tankas*.

The latter showed kindness to him, and fixed a stipend of twelve *lakhs* of *tankas* for his personal ¹ expenses, and promised that, "God willing I shall give you your hereditary dominion after recovering it from the Maghūls'

As the fame of the grandeur of Bahādur Shāh, and the report of his imperial gifts spread in the inhabited fourth part of the world, the Rāys from near and far turned their faces to his threshold, which was a seat of prosperity. The ² nephew of the Rāja of Gwālīar with a body of *Pūrabīa* Rājputs came, and were enlisted among his special attendants. ³ Bahūr, son of Prithī Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sānkā, also came with some notable Rājputs, and entered his service. Some Dakinī *sardārs* also came and attained to the good fortune of an audience (of the Sultān). All of them, in accordance with their status and position, obtained a share in his favours and gifts.

As a long time elapsed (in the Sultān's) residence in Chāmpānīr, 'Imād-ul-mulk sent his son Ja'far Khān to wait on the Sultān, and represented that, owing to his arrogance and pride, Nizām-ul-mulk Bāhrī had no inclination towards a treaty of peace. If the Sultān would once advance into the Deccan, the object of this slave would be attained. The Sultān granted his prayer, and decided to invade the Deccan. About this time, Ja'far Khān submitted, that if the Sultān permitted, he would like to go and see the city of Ahmadābād and the country of Kanbāyet, and would soon come back to attend on the Sultān. His prayer was allowed, and he had arrived in Kanbāyet, when he was informed, that the Sultān had moved out of Ahmadābād to carry out his expedition into the Deccan, and had

¹ The word حَرَج is left out from one MS.

² His name is given in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 343, as Nai Sing Dēo brother's son of Mān Singh, Rājah of Gwālīar.

³ The name is بَہُور or بَہُور in the MSS, and مہن in the lith ed., and بہرون in the lith ed. of *Firishtah*. Col Briggs calls him Sreeputty Ray (evidently mixing up the names of the father and the son), nephew of Rana Sanka. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī* says that it was Prithī Rāj, nephew of Rānā Sānkā and not his son who came. Following the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah*, I have adopted Bahrūn as the name of the Rājput chief, son of Prithī Rāj, who came. Of all the names it is the only one which has any similarity to a Hindū name. M. Hidayat Hosain has بَہُور in the text-edition.

encamped in the town of ¹ Daboh. Jāfar Khan waited on the Sultan there. The Sultan halted there for some time and again returned to ³ Muhammadabad and passed the rainy season there. ⁴ He then in the year 937 A.H. marched towards Bakar and Idar and he sent Khudawand Khan and Imad ul mulk from the village of Khanpur with a well equipped army and many elephants to Bakar and himself proceeded towards Kanbayet. He spent one day at Kanbayet and then embarked in a ship for the Dip. At the latter place all the stuffs and other merchandise which were in the ships that arrived from the various ports round about were put into various store houses. Among these things there were one thousand and six hundred maunds of roses (or rose water) from Damascus. He also showed very great kindness to the body of *Rumis* (Turks) who had ⁵ come with Muṣṭafī

¹ The name of the town is *درلوهی* in one MS. and *درانی* in the lith. ed. In the other MS. the name of the town is not mentioned. It appears from the *Ṣikandar* Bayley page 344 that the names of the two stations in the Sultan's march were the town of Dabhoi and the village of Dharohi. I have adopted the name of Daboh. M. Hidayat Hosain has *درلوهی* in the text edition.

² Bayley says in a note on page 343 of his History of Gujarat that the *Tarikh-i-Alfi Firishtah* and the *Tabakat-i-Akbar* say very little about this campaign. He gives a very brief summary of what the *Tarikh-i-Alfi* and *Firishtah* say but none of what is said in the *Tabakat*. What is said in the *Tabakat* is so mixed up with other matters and with accounts of more or less aimless wanderings that it is difficult to give any summary. I have not attempted to give a summary of what *Firishtah*, the *Ṣikandar* and the Cambridge History of India say about it but have confined myself to a translation of the text.

³ M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted *أحمد آباد* in the text edition.

⁴ *Firishtah* mentions this after giving a brief account of the campaign. His account of these journeys agrees generally with that in the text but he says that instead of buying sixteen hundred *mans* of roses or rose water of Damascus he bought sixteen hundred *mans* of *بسته و موی* pistachio nuts and dried grapes. Col. Briggs does not mention these purchases and I cannot find any mention of them anywhere else.

⁵ *Firishtah* says that they had come *برسم تجارت* i.e. as merchants and it is not clear why they were in such helpless condition and could not go back to their own country.

Sanka for protection and made him the medium for his entering the service (of the Sultan). It so happened that the Sultan had at that time gone to Banswala on a hunting expedition. Ratan Sen sent emissaries there and with great humility and meekness prayed for the pardon of Jaga's offences. The Sultan acceded to his prayer and sent for Jaga. He then laid the foundation of a noble mosque in the ¹ village and *ghat* of Karchi and gave that town (Karchi) to Prithi Raj and divided the rest of the territory of Bakar between Prithi Raj and Jaga in equal shares.

He remained there for some days with the object of hunting when scouts brought the information that Sultan Mahmud Khalji

Ratan Sen which the author of the Cambridge History of India has correctly transliterated into Vikramaditya.

¹ The name of the village کتاب کرحی Dakhlat Karchi in one MS. and داکھلات کرحی Dakhlat Karchi in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishlah it looks like لہاب کرحی Lahab Karchi. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 113) says that the king having caused a mosque to be built in the village of Lahab which he gave it over in perpetuity to Jugut Raj. Whether the mosque or the village was given in perpetuity to him is not clear and in any case the statement differs from that of Firishlah who says the Sultan gave the town to Prithi Raj. It appears from the Mirat-i-Sikandari Bayley, page 348, that *uakils* of Ratan Rajah of Chitor waited upon the Sultan at the pass of Karchi. I think therefore that the correct reading is موضع وگہاب کرحی the village and *ghat* of Karchi and I have adopted this. M. Hidayat Hosain has در موضع دکھلات کرحی in the text edition.

² There must be some mistake here. Pars Ram and not Prithi Raj was the Raja of Bakar. Prithi Raj appears to have been Raja of Dungarpu. It is not at all clear why he should have got half of Bakar to the exclusion of Pars Ram and his son, the former of whom had entered the Sultan's service and the latter had become a Musalman. The Cambridge History of India, page 35, says in a few words what happened to Bakar (as it calls it) and Banswara. It says he led an expedition into Baler and Banswara. The Rana Ratan Singh II, who had succeeded Sangrama after the battle of Sikri, interceded for the two chiefs and Bahadur stayed his hand. I am afraid this does not give much information of what actually happened and what information is given is not accurate. There is no mention of the division of Bakar, whether it was between Prithi Raj and Jaga or between Pars Ram and the latter. There was also no expedition into Banslah or Banswarah. The Mirat-i-Sikandari says definitely that the Sultan left his army behind and went to Banwala on a hunting excursion and nothing appears to have been done in respect of him or of the Raja. The names Ratan Singh and Sangrama are also both incorrect.

said to Darya Khan. On various occasions the glad tidings of a visit have reached my ears. If Sultan Mahmud comes and meets me I shall certainly not give an asylum to the fugitives from his courts. He then granted permission to the ¹ ambassador of Sultan Mahmud to return after bestowing favours on him. Then he marched towards Banswala and when he arrived at the *ghat* or pass of Karchi Ratan Sen and Silhadi hastened to wait on him. On the first day the Sultan bestowed on them thirty elephants and one thousand five hundred robes of honour made of stuff of woven gold thread. After a few days Ratan Sen obtained leave to go to Chitor but Silhadi having elected to enter the Sultan's service stayed on.

Sultan Bahadur depending on the promise of Sultan Mahmud Khalji proceeded towards Sambla and determined that if Sultan Mahmud came he would perform the ceremonies of receiving and hospitably entertaining him and then go as far as Kanbayet and the pass of Devla and after bidding him farewell there returned to the capital. At this place Muhammad Khan Asiri came and waited upon him. ² When the latter arrived at Sambla he waited for ten days for Sultan Mahmud. After that Darya Khan again came from Sultan Mahmud and informed him that his master had fallen from his horse while hunting and had broken his right arm and it was not fit that he should come in his present condition. The Sultan said

¹ The word is فرسانة in both MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah but انلحي in the lith ed of the Tabaqat.

The name is ¹ Sambla in one MS ² Sambla in the other MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah and سندله Sandla in the lith ed of the Tabaqat. Col Briggs (vol IV p 114) has Tandla and the Mirat-i-Sikandar Bayley page 350 has the village of Sambaliah. ³ Sambla in the text is apparently a mistake for Sambla.

³ The Cambridge History of India page 36 gives a very good summary of the matters in dispute at this time between the Sultan of Gujarat and Malwa but unfortunately ends with a mistake when it says Sultan Mahmud owed his tenure of his throne to the capture of Mandu from rebellious Rajputs by Mahmud Begarha. It needs scarcely be said that it was Sultan Muzaffar and not Sultan Mahmud Begarha who captured Mandu from the rebellious Rajputs (see pp 318-319 of the Cambridge History of India itself). It may also be mentioned that مندر should be transliterated as Mandu and not as Mander.

“As he has broken his promise several times, if he does not come I shall go myself. Darvā Khān again said, ‘Chānd Khān son of Sultān Muzaflar is with Sultān Mahmūd. If the latter comes and Your Majesty demands the surrender of Chānd Khān, it would be very difficult to give him up, and it would be impossible to withhold him. In truth that is the reason why he cannot come.’ Sultān Bahādur said “I have relinquished the idea of demanding the surrender of Chānd Khān. Please go and tell Sultān Mahmūd, that he should come soon.” When the emissary of Sultān Mahmūd received leave to go back, Sultān Bahādur travelled ¹ slowly along, and waited for Sultān Mahmūd’s arrival. When he arrived at Dībālpūr, it became known that Sultān Mahmūd wanted to confer the title of Sultān Ghivās-ud-din on his eldest son, and he sent him to the fort of Mandū whilst he himself should leave it and seclude himself somewhere else, and he had no desire to meet Sultān Bahādur. ² Some of the *amīns* of Sultān Mahmūd, who were aggrieved with him on account of his disagreeable behaviour towards them, came and saw Sultān Bahādur, and several of them represented to him, that Sultān Mahmūd was passing the time with idle excuses, and did not intend voluntarily to come, and Sultān Bahādur’s army should without delay begin the siege of the fort (of Mandū).

Sultān Bahādur then started from that place, and encamped at ³ Sūdpūr, and at that station, Shaizat-ul-mulk fled from the fort of Mandū, and hastened to wait on him. The next morning the army moved from that place, and encamped at the village of Dilāwarah. When the Sultān arrived at Nālcha, he directed the different detachments to take up their position for the siege. Muhammad Khān Āsiri

¹ M. Hidayat Hosain has selected بنانی طی مدارل می بیود in the text-edition.

² Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 114) says, “the delay which this arrangement involved gave the Guzerat courtiers an opportunity of again misrepresenting the conduct of Sultān Mahmūd Khiljy.” This is not quite correct. It was the Mālwa and not the Gujrāt *amīns* who complained of Sultān Mahmūd’s conduct, and it does not appear that even they misrepresented it.

³ This clause appears in one MS. where the place is called سود پور and in the lith. ed. where it is called سور پور, but not in the other MS. or in Firishtah. Neither Sūdpūr nor Sūrpūr is mentioned in any other history.

was posted to the west at the battery of ¹Shahpur and ²Ulugh Khan to Bhilpur. He sent the *Purabia* contingent to ³Pahalwanla and himself took up his quarters in the *mahals* (palaces) at ⁴Muham madpur.

On the 9th Sha ban 937 A H at the time of the true dawn the standards of Bahadur Shah rose above the horizon of the fort of Wandu. At that very moment Chand Khan son of Sultan Muzaffar got out of the fort and fled. Sultan Mahmud armed himself and with the few men that he had came out to give battle but as he ⁶did not see that he was sufficiently strong to do so he went into the palace.

¹ The name is شاه پور Shahpur in both MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah. It is شاه پور Shahpur in the lith ed of the Tabaqat. The Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 301 has the trenches at Shahpur.

² The name is اولغ خان Ulugh Khan in both MSS. The lith ed of Firishtah has لقم لقم Lqum in which is certainly incorrect but Col Briggs (vol IV p 115) improves it by making it Lokmun Sing. The lith ed of the Tabaqat has الف خان Alf Khan and the Mirat i Sikandari has Alaf Khan. As to the name of the place the MSS have بهل پور Bhilpur and پهل پور Pahlpul. The lith ed of the Tabaqat has بهل پور Bhilpur and that of Firishtah پهل پور Bahlpul. Col Briggs has Seetulpoor and the Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 301 Bahlolpur.

³ The MSS have پهلوانه Pahalwanla and the lith ed has بهگوانه Bhagwana. The lith ed of Firishtah has سلوانه Salhwana. Col Briggs has Julwara and the Mirat i Sikandari has Bahalwanah. M Hidayat Hoain has adopted سہلوانہ Sahlwanla in the text edition.

⁴ The MSS have محمد پور Muhammadpur and محمور پور Mahmudpur while the lith ed has محمود آباد Mahmudabad. The lith ed of Firishtah has محمود پور Mahmudpul and Col Briggs has Mahomedpoor while the Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 301 does not state where the Sultan took up his quarters but says that on the 90th Rajab he advanced his camp to Mahmudpur.

⁵ The date is the 9th Sha ban in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in Col Briggs but the lith ed of Firishtah has the night of the 9th Sha ban and the Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 301 has the same date. The Mirat i Sikandari describes how Sultan Bahadar himself with some great men effected an entrance into the fort by climbing a steep and high hill on the side of Sangar Chitori. The exploit was something like that of Humayun who six years later in 942 A H captured Champanir by climbing a steep hill by driving spikes into it. (See translation vol II pages 54-55.)

⁶ One MS has نداس but the other and the lith ed have ندد.

¹ to slay his wife and children. Sultān Bahādur's soldiers surrounded the *mahal* (palace) and sent a message that there was full assurance of safety to the inmates and to the *amīns* and no one would interfere with the property or the honour of any single person. Some of Sultān Mahmūd's loyal adherents made him refrain from the slaughter of his family, and told him, whatever unkindness the *Bādshah* of Gujrāt might show to him, his kindness and generosity would be greater than those of others. There was also a strong likelihood, that he would follow the example of his father and would leave the kingdom of Mālwa in the possession of Sultān Mahmūd's servants. About this time, Sultān Bahādur ascended to the top of *La'l Mahal*, and sent a man to wait on Sultān Mahmūd. The latter came with seven of the *amīns*. ² Sultān Bahādur received him with respect and courtesy, and embraced him, and tried to please him. Then when they began to converse with each other, Sultān Mahmūd showed a little harshness in his language. This displeased Sultān Bahādur, and a silence fell on the meeting. Then Sultān Mahmūd and his son were placed under arrest, and sent to Chāmpānī, and Bahādur Shāh took up his residence

¹ Wishing apparently to follow the Rājput rite of *jauhar*, but Firishtah says *بواسطه رعایت احوال عیال و اطفال برگشته حاب محل خود شهادت*, from which it would appear that he intended to look after his family and children, and not to kill them. As to what happened later, Firishtah follows the *Tabaqāt* almost *verbatim*. But the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, page 352 says that "the plunder and the killing and the making of prisoners went on for one watch and then a proclamation of quarter and safety was made". The date according to *Mirāt-i Sikandari* was the 9th (and not the 29th) Sha'ban, 937 A.H. 28th March, 1531 A.D. Col. Briggs gives the date of the 9th Shaban, February 26th and the *Cambridge History of India*, page 327, has March 17th.

² Firishtah leaves out the show of courtesy and respect and the embrace, but says that Sultān Bahādur was inclined to forgive Sultān Mahmūd, but when he asked the latter, why he had not come to meet him, he gave a harsh reply, after which things happened as stated in the *Tabaqāt*. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari*'s version (Bayley, pp. 352, 353) is somewhat different. It says that Sultān Mahmūd sought safety by asking for quarter and mercy, and came out with seven sons to wait on Sultān Bahādur. He was placed in the custody of trustworthy guards, and on the 12th Muharram he was sent to Gujārāt. This last date can scarcely be correct, as there is an interval of four months between Sha'bān and Muharram. The account given in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 327, appears to be a brief summary of that in the *Tabaqāt*.

at Mandu. He gave permission to most of his *amirs* to go back to Gujrat to their own *jagirs*.

After the rains Sultān Bahadur ¹ went to see Burhanpur and Asir and there Nizam ul mulk Dakini joined his service ² He conferred on him the title of Muhammad Shah and then returned to Mandu. About this time it became known that Silhadi ³ Purabia was not inclined to come and wait on the Sultān for the reason that he had in the time of Sultan Mahmud Khalji taken some Musalman women and in fact even some of the members of Sultan Naṣir ud dīn's harem into his own house and had kept them there. Sultān Bahadur ordered that whether he came or not it was incumbent on him (i.e. the Sultān) that he should release the Musalman women from the disgrace of *kufr* (heathenism) and the wretchedness of the slavery of *Kafirs* and should give condign punishment to Silhadi. For this purpose he sent ⁴ Muqbal Khan to Champanir so that he might go there and guard the fort and send Ikhtiyar Khan with artillery and troops and treasure. Ikhtiyar Khan came with a large army and joined the Sultān in the town of Dhar on the 20th Rabi ul aḥir 938 A.H. Sultān Bahadur ⁵ proclaimed that he was going back to Gujrat.

¹ There is a slight variation in the reading in the MSS. One has *نسر استر* *نسر* while the other has *نسر برهانپور و استر* *نسر*. The lith. ed. has *نسر* *نسر* which is incorrect.

² Firishtah says that he did so because he wanted that Nizam ul mulk Dakini or as Firishtah calls him Burhan Nizam Shah Bahri would help him in the war with Humayun which he intended to carry on but as a matter of fact the opposite of this happened for Nizam ul mulk sent an emissary to Humayun and wanted him to come and attack Gujrat. The Cambridge History of India page 37 does not mention this but it describes the interview between Bahadur Shah and Burhan Nizam Shah.

³ The suffix *Purabia* is omitted in one MS. The Cambridge History of India page 37 does not mention anything about Silhadi having taken Musalman women into his house but says that he showed no disposition to fulfil his promise to return.

⁴ It appears that Sultan Bahadur gave out that he was going to Gujrat and went away as if on a hunting excursion to Dibalpur etc. so that Silhadi might not take fright and go away to Ratan Sen son of Rana Sanku. This is expressly stated in the Mirat-i-Sikandari.

⁵ He is also called *مقرب خان* Muqbal Khan by Firishtah but is called Mukarrab Khan (*مقرب خان*) in the Mirat-i-Sikandari Bayley page 306 and is there described as brother of Ikhtiyar Khan.

and went to Mandū, so that after making the necessary preparations there, he might commence his march towards Gujrāt. He left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of Mandū, and encamped at Na'leha on the 25th of the month of Jamādi-ul-āwwal. At this time Bhūpat, son of Silhadi, submitted to the Sultān, "As the sublime standards are advancing towards Gujrāt, if this slave obtains permission to go to Ujjain, he would bring Silhadi to wait on Your Majesty after giving him assurances of safety." The Sultān gave him permission, but with great caution himself advanced towards Ujjain by successive marches. On the 15th of that month, he arrived at the town of Dhār and leaving the army there went away to ¹ Dībālpūr, Banharīa and Sa'dulpūr, as if on a hunting excursion.

Silhadi on hearing this news left Bhūpat at Ujjain, and came and waited on the Sultān. ² Amīn Nasir who had been sent to summon him told the Sultān in private, that he had brought Silhadi, by deceiving him with a promise of the grant of Kanbāyet and a ³ *krōr* in cash

¹ About Dībālpūr there is no dispute, it is spelt ديپالپور in the MSS and in the lith ed, but the Mirāt-i Sikandari calls it Dipālpūr. The second name is بنهرية Banharīa and تهرية Taharīa in the MSS, and in the lith ed. It is not mentioned in the lith ed of Firishtah or in the Mirāt-i Sikandari. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 117) calls it Bensrode. The third place is سعدلپور Sa'dulpūr in the MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah. In the lith ed of the Tabaqāt it is رسولپور Rasūlpūr. Col Briggs calls it Shoojalpoor. It is called 'Adlpūr in the Mirāt-i Sikandari, Bayley, page 357, and Bayley says in a note "The Tab Akbari calls it Sādulpūr."

² This man's name is variously given. Both the MSS call him امين امير Amīn Nasir, while the lith ed has امير امير Amīr Nasir. Firishtah lith ed has Amīr Nasir, and Col Briggs has Ameer Nuseer. The Mirāt-i Sikandari Bayley, page 356, calls him Malik Amīn Nas, and it is said there, that Nas was probably a nickname, and means, among other things, one who is beginning to be corpulent. The Cambridge History of India, page 327, calls the man Nassan Khān, and says that he had been sent to Raisen and brought Silāhdi to the court. According to the other historians he was sent, but Silhadi came only on receiving his son's message.

³ One MS has تنكه after كرور, but the other MS and the lith ed do not have it. Firishtah says the same thing but in a different order. According to him Silhadi had no wish to submit to the Sultān, and would not have if he had not been deceived by the offer of Kanbāyet and a *krōr* of *tanke*. The Mirāt-i-

As Silhadi had no thought of remaining in allegiance to the Sultan and wanted to give up his fort and to go to Mewar if he now got permission to leave ¹ it would be difficult to see him again. The Sultan then started from Sa dulpur for Dhar and talked with the *amirs* and his other adherents about seizing Silhadi. When he arrived at the camp he left the army outside and took up his residence in the fort of Dhar. He took Silhadi with him. When the Sultan got inside the fort the men who had been directed to seize Silhadi came and took him with the two other *Purabias* who were with him into custody. At this time one of Silhadi's attendants raised a clamour and placed his hand on his dagger. Silhadi told him, 'Do you want to kill me?' The man replied, 'I wanted to do it for your sake but as it causes injury to you now I can smite myself so that I might not see you in captivity' and striking his dagger under his abdomen went to ² hell. When the news of Silhadi's arrest was spread about the Gujrat army and the populace of the city plundered his camp and killed a large number of his followers and his elephants and horses and equipage were seized for the Sultan's government. Those who escaped the sword fled and joined Bhupat.

Towards the end of the day Sultan Bahadur sent ⁴ Imad ul mulk to attack Bhupat. He left *Khudawand Khan* to accompany the camp and in the morning himself started towards Ujjain. Imad ul mulk told him at this time that before his arrival Bhupat had received the news of Silhadi having been seized and he had fled and gone to Chitor. Sultan Bahadur conferred the government of Ujjain

Sikandar Bayley page 357 says the promise was to give him the port of Kam bhaat and *lakh* of *tankahs* and one hundred Arab horses.

¹ There are slight variations in the reading. The MSS have *دیں او ار* *دیں او نار معالسل* and *مجالسل* while the lith ed has *دیں او را معالسل* and Firsihtah lith ed has *دیں او نار دیگر معالسل*.

² The word *jamdhar* a kind of dagger was used once before describing the attack on *Kher Muhammad Khan* by one of the Rajputs who came as ambassador to him from the Raja of Sirohi.

³ The word is *جهنم* in both MSS and in the corresponding passage of Firsihtah but it is *عدم* non-existence in the lith ed.

⁴ Firsihtah calls him Rafi ul mulk who had the title of Imad ul mulk. The Cambridge History of India page 398 calls him Imad ul Mulk Malik, son of Tawakkul.

on Daryā Khān, who was one of the old *amīrs* of Mālwa, and had formerly come as the ambassador to Sultān Bahādur and advanced towards Sārangpūr. He bestowed Sārangpūr on Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, who had in the time of Sultān Muzaḥḥar gone away from Mandū, and ¹ had entered the service of _____ and who in the reign of Shēr Khān had assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and had the public prayers read and the coin struck in that country in his own name, some account of him will be written before long. And having given permission to ² Habīb Khān the ruler (*uālī*) of Āshta to go back to Āshta, himself marched towards Bhīlsa and Rāīsīn. Habīb Khān went to Āshta, and took possession of it, after slaying a large number of the *Pūrabās*. When the Sultān arrived at Bhīlsa, it became known (to him), that it was eighteen years since the time when all vestiges of Islām ³ had disappeared from that country and the rites of heathenism had gained currency there. At this time spies ⁴ informed the Sultān, that when Bhūpat, the son of Silhadī,

¹ The words in the MSS and in the lith ed, as well as in the lith ed of Firishtah who copies the *Tabaqūt* closely, are ملازم شده بود without specifying the person whose servant he had become, but, according to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 358, he had from the time of the Sultān's (i.e., Sultān Bahādar's) accession been in continuous attendance upon him, thus explains his having become a *mulāzīm*. It appears that he was a servant of the Khālji Sultāns of Mālwa, who afterwards assumed the title of Qādir Shāh, and ruled in Mandū, Ujjain, Sārangpūr and Rantambhōr.

² The readings in the MSS are حبیب خان اشته والی را and حبیب خان والی الله and in the lith ed حبیب خان والی را. I have changed the sequence to حبیب خان والی اشته را.

³ The language in one MS and in the lith ed is آثار اسلام اریں دیار کوچ کرد. The "marching away" of the vestiges of Islām appears to me to be inappropriate. The language in the other MS آثار اسلام اریں دیار برطرف شده is better, and I have adopted it. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has منقطع گشته instead of برطرف شده. It appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 358, that "Bhīlsah which had been converted to Islām by Sultān Shams-ud-dīn of Dehli", but having been eighteen years in the possession of Silhadī, "Muhamadan law and custom had been set aside for idolatry".

⁴ The reading in one MS is رسالین سامان, and in the other رسالین اعلى. I have changed it to رسالین سامان, but the lith ed has neither سامان nor اعلى.

went to Chitor ¹ Lakhman Sen the brother of Silhadi had strengthened the citadel of Raisin and was making preparations for a battle and was waiting for reinforcement from Chitor

² Sultan Bahadur waited at Bhilsa for three days for the erection of mosques and other houses for pious purposes (بُناحِ حبرِ دران) and marched from there on the 7th of Jamadi ul awwal of that year and encamped at a distance of two *karohs* from the town on the bank of the river On the morning of Wednesday the 8th of the aforesaid month he had the kettle drum of victory beaten and set up his position on the ³ bank of the reservoir of Raisin The army had not yet arrived when the *Punabia* Rajputs divided themselves into two detachments and sallied out of the fort Sultan Bahadur with the few men that he had with him attacked them himself ⁴ hewing down two or three men into halves from their wastes The army of Gujrat arrived one after another from behind and completely routed the

¹ The name is لکھمن Lakhman and لکھم سن Lakhm Sen in different places in the MSS and لکھمن سن Lakhmin Sen in the lith ed It is لکھمن Lakhmar in the lith ed of Firishtah Col Briggs has Lokmun Singh and the Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 360 has Lakhman Sen The Cambridge History of India page 378 has Lakhman Singh I think Lakhman Sen is the correct form of the name and I have adopted it

² Firishtah agrees as to what Sultan Bahadur did at Bhilsa but he does not mention his encamping on the bank of the river and he says that he set up his ³ نارگاہ in Ra in on the 8th of the Jamadi ul awwal The Mirat i Sikandari Bayley page 358 says the Sultan left Bhilsah on the 17th Jumadi ul akhur and proceeded by successive marches to a river two *kos* from Raisin On the next day he pitched his camp on the bank of the tank near the fort of Raisin In spite of these contradiction about the date the Cambridge History of India page 39 says that Bahadur was attacked as he approached the town on January 26

³ Both MSS have براسن نارگاہ برافراحت and Firishtah lith ed has براسن but I prefer برحوص راسن which is in the lith ed and which agrees with the Mirat i Sikandari M Hidayat Hosain however has followed the MSS in the text edition

⁴ Firishtah agrees but Col Briggs (vol IV p 119) says Bahadur Shah slew ten men with his own hand and Bayley in a note on page 358 ascribes as in the other cases Col Briggs's statement to Firishtah

infidels The *Pūrabīas*, ¹ being struck by the bravery and courage of Sultān Bahādūr took shelter in the fort The Sultān forbade his soldiers from continuing the fight, and postponed it for the following day

The next day he marched from that place, and fixing on the fort as the centre, distributed the batteries (among the different commanders), and commenced the construction of covered passages Within a short time these reached a place whence they commanded the garrison The Sultān went there himself, and leaving Rūmī K̲h̲ān with the artillery, returned to his quarters Rūmī K̲h̲ān brought down two of the bastions of the fort by firing from his cannons He also dug a mine from another side, and setting fire to it blew down some yards of the wall on that side Silhadī seeing the weakness of the *Pūrabīas*, and the great strength of the enemy sent a message to the following effect, "This slave wishes to be dignified with the nobility of Islām, and after that if he gets leave, he would ² go above, and after evacuating the fort, make it over to the representative of the Bahādūr Shāhī government' The Sultān was delighted on hearing this news, and summoning Silhadī to his presence, repeated to him the words expressing the unity of God When Silhadī accepted the faith, the Sultān gave him a special robe of honour, and sent him various kinds of food from the (royal) kitchen He then took Silhadī with him to the foot of the fort

Silhadī summoned Lakhman, his brother, and said to him, "As I am now included in the community of Musalmāns, Sultān Bahādūr will, either on account of a feeling of communal favour, or on account of his noble spirit, raise me to a high rank It is fit that after surrendering the fort to the adherents of the Sultān, I

¹ The actual words in the MSS and in the lith ed are گوش گرتنه the meaning of which is not quite clear to me

² The meaning is not quite clear The words are بالا رفتنه in both MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah, but they are omitted from the lith ed. of the *Tabaqāt* The meaning probably is, "Going up into the fort" It would be remembered that he was a prisoner in the Sultān Bahādūr's camp, and it appears from the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 359, that he informed the Sultān, "Having obtained the friendly offices of some of the chief nobles"

should bind the girdle of service strongly and should continue to render him service ¹ His brother then told him privately that now that it is not right according to their religion to shed your blood and Bhupat is coming to their assistance bringing the Rana and forty thousand men with him something should be done so that there might be a delay of a few days longer in the capture of the fort Silhadi having applauded this opinion said to the Sultan Let this matter be postponed today ~ Tomorrow after two watches (*pas*) of the day the fort would be evacuated and made over to the servants of the Sultan

Sultan Bahadur then left that place and returned to his residence and waited for two watches of the (next) day to pass When a moment elapsed after the appointed time Silhadi again represented to the Sultan If you order this slave would go near the fort and having ascertained the state of things would report Sultan Bahadur made Silhadi over to trustworthy men and sent him to the neighbourhood of the fort Silhadi went to the fallen bastion and began to give advice to the people in the fort He said Oh ye careless Rajpūts! take note of the Sultan He would immediately come out of the battery and put you all to death His object was this that they should immediately rebuild the bastions Lakhman gave no reply and Silhadi returned in a state of fear That night Lakhman

¹ According to the plan of deceiving the Sultan first originated with Lakhman and according to the *Mirat-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 360 Silhadi informed the Sultan that he was willing to become a Musalman as he was afraid that the Sultan's attack would be successful and all his people would be slaughtered but according to the *Cambridge History of India* page 398

Silhadi conciliated Bahadur by perfidiously feigning to accept Islam and thus obtained permission to meet his brother ostensibly with the object of arranging for the surrender of the fortress but when he and Lakhman Singh met they agreed to await the relieving force expected from Chitor

This is on the face of it somewhat contradictory If they agreed to await the arrival of the relieving force (only) when they met Silhadi could not have perfidiously feigned to accept Islam and have met his brother

² The relieving force is said to have been forty thousand in the MSS and in the lith ed of Firsihtah and in Col Briggs's translation It is four thousand in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* The *Mirat-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 360 makes it forty or fifty thousand picked horse and artillery and innumerable infantry

sent two thousand *Pūrabās* with a ¹ son of Silhadi to the station where Bhūpat was. ² Silhadi's son began to fight, and the Gujrāt army having exerted themselves beyond the power of men, killed many of the Rājputs, and sent the head of Silhadi's son with the heads of other Rājputs to the Sultān.

When Silhadi received information of the death of his son, he fainted. Sultān Bahādur now became aware of the real state of things, and made Silhadi over to Burhān-ul-mulk, so that he might be kept in prison in the fort of Mandū. At this time news came, that Bhūpat was bringing the Rānā with him from Chitōi. As he knew that the Sultān had arrived *jarīda*, or with a small force, the Rānā with great audacity came along by successive marches. The Sultān said, 'Although I may have only a small force with me still in accordance with the saying, that one Musalmān is equal to ten *Kāfis*, I shall meet them.' The Sultān's ³ wrath became violent on hearing the news of the Rānā's approach and he immediately sent Muhammad Khān the ruler of Burhānpūr, and 'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī for their chastisement. When Muhammad Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk arrived in the town of ⁴ Sarīsa, news came that the Rānā and Bhūpat had arrived near the town of ⁵ Kahrār. Muhammad

¹ The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. say simply *پسر ساہدی* Silhadi's son, but Firishtah has Silhadi's younger son (*کوچک*), and Col Briggs has Silhuddy's youngest son. He is called a younger son of Silhadi in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 361, and Silāhdi's youngest son in the *Cambridge History of India*, page 328.

² He was apparently intercepted by the Gujrāt army. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 361, gives a different version of the incident. According to it, "A younger son of Silhadi's made an attack upon a royal post in the town of Barsiah with two thousand horse. But the Musulmāns were victorious, and the infidel fled to his elder brother, Bhūpat."

³ One MS. has *فوة عینی* but the other MS. and the lith. ed. have *فوت عینی*.

⁴ The name of the town is *سر* Sarīsa in one MS. and looks like *سیرسیدہ* in the other. In the lith. ed. it is *سورسہ* Sirsa. Firishtah and Col Briggs do not give the name of the place, but say they had not gone far when they met Poorunmal. The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 361, has Barsiah. The *Cambridge History of India* does not give the name of the place.

⁵ The name is *کھرار* Kahrār and *کھرار* Khirār in the MS. It is *کھوار* Kahrār in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has *کھرلہ* Kehrla. Col Briggs does

Khan and Imād ul mulk arrayed their troops for battle and advanced towards them and when they arrived in the vicinity of Kahrar Puran Mal another son of Silhadi¹ appeared there with two thousand *Purabia* Rajpūts. Muhammad Khān advanced to attack the fort but Puran Mal fled without fighting and some of the *Purabias* who were under him were taken prisoner. Muhammad Khān and Imād ul mulk submitted a report to the Sultān to the effect that Puran Mal had fled and joined the Rana and the latter had arrived quite near and although the force under him was beyond any computation still relying on divine help and the auspicious fortune of His Majesty they would not hold themselves excused from making all efforts to attack him.

On receiving this report the Sultān left Ikhtiyār Khān and other *amirs* to carry on the siege and marching very rapidly traversed in the course of a night and a day seventy *Milwā karohs* and shone like a flash of lightning in the neighbourhood of Kahrar. Muhammad Khān went a part of the way to receive him and brought him to his own quarters.

The spies of Rana and Bhupat took them the news that the Sultān had on the preceding night joined his army and his troops which were like swarms of locusts and ants would arrive almost immediately. The Rana on hearing this news retired and sat down one stage behind (his previous camp). In the morning Sultān Bahadur advanced one stage beyond Kahrar. At this place two Rajputs came as emissaries with the object of making inquiries and delivered the following messages from the mouth of the Rana. The Rana was one of the servants of the threshold and his object in coming to these parts was that he would advance his foot by way of intercession

not give the name of the place. The *Mirat-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 361 has Kharod while the *Cambridge History of India* page 38 has Kamkera.

¹ The word is ظافر in one MS and in the 1th ed and حاصر in the other MS. *Firishtah* lith ed also has حاصر. According to the MSS and the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* as well as the lith ed of *Firishtah* and the *Mirat-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 361 and the *Cambridge History of India* page 398 the force under Puran Mal was two thousand men but Col Briggs (vol IV p 121) makes it ten thousand cavalry.

and ask for the ¹ pardon of Silhadi's offences' The Sultān said, "At present ² his forces and grandeur are greater than mine. If he had submitted a petition ³ without fighting, ⁴ he would of course have attained his object. When those two Rājpūts went back, and reported that they had seen the Sultān with their own eyes, the Rānā and Bhūpat in spite of all their great strength and pomp fled, making ⁵ three or four stages into one. At this time, news came that ⁶ Ulugh Khān with thirty-six thousand horsemen, and the elephants and artillery of Gujrāt had arrived in the neighbourhood. The Sultān owing to his great bravery, did not wait for the arrival of Ulugh Khān, but pursued the enemy for seventy *karōhs* with only the troops that

¹ The word is استعفى, and looks like استعفاء in the MS. It is استعفا in the lith. ed. I have retained the latter though Firishtah has استعفى. Of course استعفى and استعفار have the same meaning, the latter has been used by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text edition.

² The words are مهيت وشوكت in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and مهيت وشوكت او in the other MS. I think the latter reading is better and I have adopted it. The Sultān was addressing the emissary, but the force and grandeur he was referring to was not theirs, but the Rānā's.

³ The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is نگ کردہ نہ but in the other MS. it is نگ ناکردہ. This latter is the correct reading and I have adopted it. Firishtah lith. ed. also has نگ ناکردہ.

⁴ The reading is مطارب in both MSS. and in the lith. ed. and مطارب also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, although it is misplaced there before مطارب. I think او would be better, and I have adopted it, but M. Hidayat Hosain has retained مطارب in the text edition.

⁵ Both MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have سه چہار but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has چہار. The making of three or four stages into one shows the rapidity of their flight.

⁶ The name is الع حان Ulugh Khān in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt has الحان Alf Khān, and Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 121) has Aluf Khan. The Mirāt-i Sikandarī has Alaf Khān, but Bayley in a note, page 362, says there is the usual confusion between Alaf and Ulugh. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the arrival of the reinforcement, or the name of the commander. The number of horsemen is thirty-six thousand in the MSS. and in the Muāt-i Sikandarī but it is thirty thousand in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt, and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and also in Col. Briggs's history.

he had with him. The Rana however got into Chitōr and the Sultan leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rana to the next year returned to Raisin and on arriving there made the siege closer than before.

About the end of Pīrādan when Lakhman became hopeless of receiving reinforcement and saw destruction before his eyes he came forward with humility and submission and submitted a representation that if the Sultan could summon Silhadi to his presence and would draw the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences and would give him assurance of safety this slave (that is he himself) would evacuate the fort and ¹ would surrender it to him. The Sultan after much consideration reminded himself that his object in undertaking the expedition was to free the Muslim women from the disgrace of *kufr* (heathenism). If their (i.e. Lakhman's and Silhadi's) prayer is not acceded to it is likely that there should be a *jauhar* and those helpless women would all be killed. Considering all this he granted Lakhman's prayer and summoned Silhadi to his presence from the fort of Mandu. Burhan ul mulk hastened from Mandu bringing Silhadi with him.

After Silhadi had come Lakhman hastened to wait (on the Sultan) and having obtained a *farman* granting assurance of safety (to Silhadi) went up to the fort. The Sultan detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort. Lakhman brought down the families of the other Rajputs from the fort but kept his own family and those of Taj Khan and of the principal Rajputs in the fort. He again represented to the Sultan that there were about ² four hundred women who appertained to Silhadi and Rani Durgawati the mother of Bhupat had a prayer that as Silhadi had become one of the special slaves of the Sultan

¹ One MS and the lith ed have تسليم مبنیاد but the other MS has تسليم مبنیاد. The lith ed of the Tabaqat omits the passages from عرصداست to بحاطر آوردند. Firishta's lith ed in the corresponding passage has تسليم ملازمان مبنیاد.

² It is not clear how Taj Khan got mixed up with the Rajputs. Col Briggs (vol IV pp 1-11) says that Taj Khan who had come to negotiate on the part of Lokmun was permitted to return to the fort.

³ The Mirat-i-Sikanda Bayley page 363 makes the number seven or eight hundred.

if he was allowed to come to the fort, and to take down the members of his own family from it, the latter would be protected from the taunt of being taken down by strangers. The Sultān sent Malik 'Alī Shēr with Silhadī to the fort and when the latter arrived there, Lakhman and Tāj Khān asked of him, "What would the Sultān grant to them in exchange for the fort of Rāisīn, and the country of Gōndwāna?" Silhadī said "At present the town of Barōda with its dependencies has been determined upon for our residence and it is likely that the Sultān would out of his generosity exalt me (more)."

Rānī Durgāwatī and Lakhman and Tāj Khān said, 'Although the Sultān would show us favour and kindness still for many generations this country has been in our possession in reality if not in name, like an empire and now fate has ordained that we should all be (again) together. The right way of bravery is this, that we should perform *jauhar* of our women and children, and should ourselves fight and be slain, and there should be no further longing left in our hearts.' Silhadī was much moved by Rānī Durgāwatī's words and assumed an attitude of rebellion and revolt. Although Malik 'Alī Shēr offered much friendly counsel it was of no avail. (Silhadī) said in reply to Malik Shēr, "Every day one *lōī* of betel leaves, and some seeds of camphor are consumed in my harem and every day ¹ three hundred women put on new garments. If we are killed with our women and children, what honour and glory! He then arranged for the rite of *jauhar*, and Rānī Durgāwatī taking her ² daughter-in-law who

¹ The word is سیصد, but I suppose it means three hundred, and not thirteen hundred, or three thousand. The lith. ed. is defective here, having مال instead of نان and leaving out the words سیصد. There is a slight difference in the MSS. also, one has هر دور, سیصد, but the other has هر دارم که. Silhadī's ideas of his own pomp and grandeur were rather curious.

² The word is عروس, which ordinarily means a bride but it can only mean a daughter-in-law here. The lith. ed. of Firishtah, however omits the word عروس, and makes Rānī Durgāwatī herself the daughter of Rānū Sānkā. The passage in the Mirāt-i Sikandarī is doubtful. It is said there according to the translation, that a daughter of the Rānī, who was the wife of Bhūpat was among the seven hundred women who were burnt. Bayley, page 365, in a note says that the word wife may be a mistake for mother. I think, however, that the account in the Tabaqāt is correct.

was the daughter of Rana Sanka with (her) two children by the hand got into the *jauhar* and they with seven hundred beautiful women were burnt ¹ Silhadi with Taj Khan and Lakhman then armed themselves and coming out fought with the Dakini infantry who had gone up to the fort When the news reached the camp the Gujrat army galloped up to the fort and sent that ill fated band to hell while of the army of Sultan Bahadur only four foot soldiers attained to the happiness of martyrdom

About this time Sultan Alam the ruler of Kalpi came as a suppliant to Sultan Bahadur against the assaults of the armies of ² His Majesty Jinnat Ashiani Sultan Bahadur granted the forts of Raisin and Chanderi and the territories of Bhilsa as a *jagir* to him He also appointed Muhammad Khan the ruler of Asir to capture the fort of Kakrun which in the time of Sultan Mahmud Khalji had come into the possession of the Rana and himself started on an expedition to hunt elephants He captured many elephants and after meeting out their deserts to the rebels of the ³ hilly country of Kanur made it over to ⁴ Ulugh Khan He also took possession of Islamabad and Hushangabad and the whole of the country of Malwa which was in the possession of *zamindars* and granted them as *jagirs* to the *amirs*

¹ The Cambridge History of India page 38 says that the Rajputs showed little of their usual spirit although they were all slain the losses of the Muslims amounted to no more than four or five It appears however from Firishtah that the total number of Rajputs was not more than one hundred and according to the Mirat-i-Sikandari they offered a stout resistance

Firhtah agree with this and the Mirat-i-Sikandari gives an account of Sultan Alam from which it appears that he was placed in charge of Kalpi by Nizam Ali Khalifah Babar's uar He ruled Kalpi well during Babar's lifetime but after his death he rebelled against Humayun and then sought shelter with Sultan Bahadur The Cambridge History of India page 38 however says that He had fled from his principality before Babur

³ The name is كوة کالو in one MS and in the lith ed and کالور in the other MS Firishtah lith ed also كوة کالو but the Mirat-i-Sikandari Bayley page 368 has the fort of Kanur and the Cambridge History of India page 398 Kanor M Hidayat Hosain has adopted کالور in the text edition

⁴ The name is الحان and الحان in the MS and الف حان in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has الف حان and the Mirat-i-Sikandari and the Cambridge History of India page 39 have Alp Khan

of Gujrāt, and to his own trusted adherents. When Muhammad Khān, the ruler of Asīr, was advancing towards Kākiūn, Sultān Bahādur also arrived in that neighbourhood with great rapidity.¹ A man of the name of Rām, who was the governor of the place on behalf of the Rānā, evacuated it, and fled. Sultān Bahādur occupied himself there for four days in festive assembly and entertainment, and granted rewards and favours to each one of the men who were near his person. He then sent 'Imād-ul-mulk and Ikhtiyārī Khān, who were among his great nobles, to capture the fort of² Mandisōr, and himself went to Mandū. The governor of Mandisōr, who was an officer of the Rānā evacuated it³ and fled, and in the course of one month the forts of Kākiūn and Mandisōr came into the Sultān's possession.

The Sultān advanced from Mandū to Chāmpānī. Information came at the latter place, that the⁴ *firangīs* had come to the port of

¹ The MSS have رام نامی, while the lith ed has رام نام. The lith ed of Firishtah has رام حی نامی. The name is not given either by Col Briggs or in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* or in the *Cambridge History of India*. It would appear from Col Briggs and the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* that Muhammad Shāh had not yet succeeded in capturing Gāgrūn, but when Sultān Bahādur appeared, the place was evacuated (Bayley, pp 367, 368).

² The name is دانتور Dantūr, and داسور Dastūr in the MSS and looks like دمتور Damtūr in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has دسور Rasūr, and Col Briggs has Runtunbhore (vol IV, p 123). The *Mirāt-i-Sikandari*, Bayley, page 368, and the *Cambridge History of India* have Mandisōr or Mandasor, which I have adopted.

³ There is some difference in the readings. One MS has ولعد را حالی گداسته گریخت. The other has the same, but inserts ناتر between گداسته and گریخت. The lith ed has حالی کوده باشده گریخت. Firishtah lith ed has the same reading as the first MS, and I have adopted it.

⁴ With reference to this, see the footnote in Col Briggs, vol IV, page 123, from which it appears that according to Faria e Souza (tome I, part iv, chapter iv) it was one of the greatest efforts made by the Portuguese, but it appears to have failed entirely. The fleet consisted of four hundred vessels, on which were embarked three thousand six hundred European soldiers and ten thousand native soldiers, besides seamen and Lascars. The Mahomedans under Moostufa Khan the Governor of Diū or Dip so completely repulsed the attack that the Portuguese had to return to Goa. Bayley also in a note, on page 369, says that it was a very important struggle, and he hoped to discuss it more

Dip and had raised the standard of power. The Sultan advanced towards Dip and when he arrived in its neighbourhood (he heard) that the *firangis* had fled and a great cannon which exceeded in size all other cannon in India came into his possession. The Sultan had it conveyed to Champanir by means of a special machine. He then determined to seize Chitor and marched from Dip to Kan bayet and from there to Ahmadabad. Here he went on pilgrimage to the tombs of the holy Shaikhs and of his great ancestors. He collected troops and with the artillery of Dip and Gujrat advanced towards Chitor. ¹ At this time Muhammad Zaman Mirza fled from the court of His Majesty Humayun Badshah and came as a suppliant to the Sultan. When the latter arrived at Chitor the Rana shut himself up in the fort and the period of the siege was prolonged to three months. On many occasions brave men prepared for combat came out from the two armies and performed gallant deeds. On most of these occasions victory and triumph fell to the lot of the Gujratis. In the end the Rana came forward with humility and paid a large subsidy and making the crown and the jewelled belt which he had taken from Sultan Mahmud Khalji the ruler of Malwa and some horses and elephants the ransom of his life turned the Sultan back to Gujrat.

This victory and the coming of Muhammad Zaman Mirza and the gathering together of the descendants of Sultan Bahlul Ludi in his service became the cause of the increase of Sultan Bahadur's pride. It also became the cause that set on move the chain of hostility with His Majesty Muhammad Humayun Badshah. In order to carry out this intention he conferred favours on Tatar Khan son of Sultan Ala ud din son of Sultan Bahlul Ludi who was distinguished above

fully in an appendix on Portuguese affairs in his second volume. The Cambridge History of India page 39 only mentions Bahadur's visit to Diu and says nothing whatever about the attack by the Portuguese.

¹ Muhammad Zaman Mirza was a prisoner in the fort of Biana and fled from there in the year 940 A.H.

About this belt see Note on page 14 of Col Briggs's History vol IV from which it appears that it was sent with Bahadur Shah's family to Medina and it eventually found its way in the shape of a present to the Grand Seignior Soliman the Magnificent.

all his equals in manliness and bravery, and paid ¹thirty *krōrs* of gold to Burhān-ul-mulk, the governor of the fort of ²Ranthambōr, so that in concert with him and with his advice the money might be spent by Tātār Khān in collecting an army. Within a short time about forty thousand horse assembled round Tātār Khān. He began to make incursions on the outskirts of the dominions of His Majesty Jūmat Āshīānī. In the year 941 A.H. repeated letters came from

¹ The actual words in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. are, سی کرور زر, which means thirty *krōrs* of gold coin (probably *Muzaffarīs*) and Firishtah has definitely سی کرور مطهری thirty *krōrs* of *Muzaffarīs*. Col Briggs, however, has three crores of rupees and says, in a note, three millions sterling. The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* (Bayley, p. 382) does not mention the amount, but it says that thirty (not forty as in the text) thousand horse were placed under Tātār Khān Lodī to march to Dehli by way Bānānah.

² The MSS. and the lith. ed. have برهان ملک حاکم قلعه رتھ، Burhān ul-mulk, the governor of the fort of Ranthambōr, but Firishtah lith. ed. has برهان الملك حاکم قلعه اسیر, Burhān ul-mulk the governor of the fort of Asir, while Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 125) has Imad ul-ool Moolk, the governor of Runtunbhore. The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* does not mention Burhān-ul-mulk or 'Imād ul-mulk. The Cambridge History of India, page 330, has Burhān ul-Mulk governor of Ranthambhor.

³ The MSS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have بر تاتار حال, but the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt* has تا تاتار حال. I have adopted the former reading.

⁴ It appears from the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 375, that several letters passed between Humāyūn and Bahādar about the extradition or expulsion of Muhammad Zamān Mirzā. In the first letter Humāyūn urged Bahādar to act in an amicable spirit, in the second he expressed surprise at Bahādar's unfriendly conduct. A copy of the third letter is given in Mīr Abū Turāb's *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt*, and a translation of it in Bayley's *History of Gujarāt*. A copy of the fourth letter, which was Bahādar's reply, is also given in the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* and a translation of it by Bayley. It appears from the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 380, that Bahādar's replies were written by Mullā Mahmūd Munshī, who had been formerly in Humāyūn's service, but had done something which had greatly incensed the latter, and he had accordingly fled and taken refuge with Sultān Bahādar. The drafts of these letters by this man were in rude and insolent language, but Bahādar's ministers, who were wise and prudent men, had all the insulting expressions erased before the letters were sent. The last draft was, however, brought by the Munshī to the Sultān when he was drunk, and he directed it to be despatched at once, and it was sent accordingly, when the Munshī had affixed the Sultān's seal to it. Next morning when the ministers and the other *amīns* saw the draft they were surprised at its insolent language,

Humayun Badshah to Sultān Pāhadur to the effect that even if he does not send Muhammad Zamān Mirza to his presence he should at least expel him from his own dominions. Sultān Bahadur on account of his great pride and self glorification did not send a satisfactory reply. In addition to this Tatar Khan attacked Biana and seized it. His Majesty Jinnat Āshiani sent Hindal Mirza to crush him. When the Mirza arrived in the neighbourhood of Biana the men who had gathered round Tatar Khan dispersed and not more than two thousand horsemen remained with him. Owing to his great shame and remorse that he had spent such a large sum of money upon his faithless soldiers he could not go and wait on the Sultān and ask him for further help. Having no alternative left he decided on a battle and when the two armies met he made an onslaught on the centre of Mirza Hindal's army and was with the three hundred men who were with him slain and the fort of Biana came into the possession of Mirza the royal officer.

His Majesty Jinnat Āshiani took this victory to be a good omen and advanced to crush Sultān Bahadur. It so happened that the latter had at this time again advanced to seize the fort of Chitōr with a large army and all the appliances for the capture of fort. When the news of the defeat and death of Tatar Khan and of the advance of His Majesty (Humayun) reached him at the foot of the fort of Chitor he became extremely anxious and had a conference as to the course he should adopt. The opinion of most of the *amirs* was to the effect that he should raise the siege of Chitor and advance to meet Humayun but ¹ Sadr Khan who was the greatest of his nobles submitted. We are besieging the *Kafir* if a Badshah of the Musalmans comes to attack us he would be supporting and helping the *Kafir* and ² such an act would be talked about among Musalmans.

A messenger on a swift horse was at once sent to intercept the letter but he was unable to do so and the letter reached Humayun and was the direct cause of the war between the two sovereigns.

¹ It is curious that although he is called the *برزگترین امیر* he has never been mentioned before. Firishtah lith. ed. has by mistake *حیدر خان* Haidar Khan. The Cambridge History of India page 330 has Sadr Khan one of his officers.

² One MS. has by mistake *امیر روزنا* *امیر*.

till the day of the resurrection. It is right for Your Majesty's benefit, that we should not abandon the siege, and there is a strong likelihood that he (i.e., Humāyūn) would not attack us during this time." When His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī encamped at Sārangpūr, and the facts of this conference were reported to him, he halted there for a few days, so that Sultān Bahādur having erected covered ways, took the fort of Chitōr by force and violence, and put a large number of Rājputīs to death.

When Sultān Bahādur after his mind had been freed from all anxieties about the conquest of Chitōr advanced to fight with Humāyūn Bādshāh, the latter also having had the drum of departure beaten, prepared to meet him, and the two armies met each other in the vicinity of Mandisōr. While the tents had not yet been fixed, Sayyid 'Alī Khān and Khurāsān Khān, who were the commanders of the vanguard of Sultān Bahādur's army, fled from the army to His Majesty the Humāyūn Bādshāh, and united with the main body. The Gujrātīs on seeing this were heartbroken. Sultān Bahādur then took counsel with the *amīns* and the leaders of different groups as to the way in which the war should be carried on. Sadr Khān said, "We should fight a drawn battle tomorrow,¹ for the troops have gained strength and courage from the capture of Chitōr, and their eyes have not yet been frightened by the power and grandeur of the Mughal army."

² Rūmī Khān, who was the officer in-charge of the artillery of Sultān

¹ The MSS have ولسکریان. The lith. ed. has چراکه لسكریاں, while the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* has کہ لسكریاں.

² Rūmī Khān's statement that cannon and muskets do not come into action in a battle appears to be preposterous on the face of it, and it is strange that his advice was accepted by Sultān Bahādur, and acquiesced in by the other leaders. None of the other histories says anything about the treachery of Rūmī Khān, but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*, Bayley, page 383, and the following pages, gives a circumstantial, and what appears to me, a convincing account of such treachery. It appears that Sultān Bahādar had given a promise to Rūmī Khān, that he would place him in command of the fortress of Chitōr, but after it was taken, the ministers and nobles were jealous and strongly objected, and the Sultān could not keep his promise at the time. Rūmī Khān was deeply offended, and he wrote secretly to Humāyūn, and informed him that if he would march in that direction the defeat of Sultān Bahādar might easily be compassed, "for", he wrote "the Sultān places entire reliance on my judgment, and I will contrive a way for the success of the Emperor's army." The words within inverted

Bahadur submitted that cannon and muskets ¹ do not come into use in a battle and the artillery which has come into the possession of this government is such that it is not known whether any sovereign except the *Qaisar* of *Rūm* (the Sultan of Turkey) has anything like it. On this account it is advisable that a ditch should be dug around the army and skirmishes should be fought every day and bold warriors of the Mughal army would come and deliver attacks all round the camp and would be killed by the discharges of cannon and the muskets.

Sultan Bahadur approved of this plan and a ditch was dug round the camp. At this time Sultan Ālim Kalpiwāl on whom Sultan Bahadur had conferred *Rūsin* and *Chanderi* and that *suba* as *jagirs* came with a large army and joined the Gujrat camp. For two months the two armies sat face to face and ² the Mughal troops raided round the camp and shut up the way of the ingress and egress of grain. After some days had elapsed in this way a ⁴ great scarcity made its

commas are also within inverted commas in Bayley's history from which it would appear that the writer had seen the letter and was quoting from it but unfortunately no reference has been given.

¹ The *Tarikh-i Gujarat* (Denison Ross p. 14) however says something which is slightly different and which if correct makes the advice less absurd. It says what Rumi Khan said was ما بوب و ننگ بساز داریم آنها را کار نقرمانم و سناه خود را and further on و بدرج هر روز طرح جنگ انداخته معولان را و بر روی بکسن دهیم و بوجانه ندارد و بوبها را سر دغد. As a matter of fact however much use does not appear to have been made of the cannon and muskets.

The Tarikh-i Gujarat (p. 14) says که ارابه کنند. Sir Denison Ross the editor of the *Tarikh-i Gujrat* says *araba* means an enclosed camp or *ariba* although in the dictionary it only means a cart or wagon.

² Firishtah's account explains better how it was that the Mughal army suffered such small loss from the cannon and muskets of the Gujratis and was still able to blockade the camp.

⁴ A graphic but what appears to me to be a somewhat exaggerated account of this scarcity is given in the *Mirat-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 384. On the same and also on the next page a further instance is given of Rumi Khan's treachery. It appears that a leader of *Banjara*s came and told Sultan Bahadur that he had brought a mill on bullock loads of grain but could not bring them into the camp for fear of the Moghals. Sultan Bahadur accordingly sent out five thousand men secretly at night to escort the *Banjara*s but Rumi Khan wrote and informed Humayun and the Gujarati escort was defeated and the grain was intercepted and taken into the Moghal camp.

appearance in the Gujrāt army and all the fodder that was in the neighbourhood was entirely exhausted. Owing to the attacks of the Mughals, no one had the power, that he should go to a distance from the camp and bring grain and fodder. Sultān Bahādur saw that his remaining there any longer would result in his capture. Therefore one night he came out from behind his pavilion and, with five of his trusted *amīrs*, one of whom was the governor of Burhānpūr and another ¹ Mallū Qādir Khān, governor of Mālwa ² fled towards Mandū. When his army came to know of his flight ³ each man fled in a (different) direction.

His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī Humāyūn Bād-shāh ⁴ pursued (Sultān Bahādur) to the foot of the fort of Mandū, and on the way many men were killed. Sultān Bahādur shut himself up in Mandū and after some time ⁵ Hindū Bēg Qūlkhīn and a number of other Mughal *amīrs* got into the fort from the ⁶ bastion of the seven hundred steps. Sultān

¹ One MS omits Qādir

² A somewhat different account of the circumstances attending and immediately proceeding Sultān Bahādur's flight is given in the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* Bayley, pp 385, 386. The date of the flight is given as the 20th Ramazān 941 A H, 25th March 1535 A D. The Cambridge History of India page 331 gives 25th April, 1535, as the date of the flight. The *Tārīkh-i Gujarāt* (pp 17, 18) has a rather incoherent account of Sultān Bahādur's proceedings immediately before his flight.

³ One MS and the lith. ed. have *هر کدام* but the other MS has *هر کدامی*, I have adopted the former.

⁴ One MS and the lith. ed. have *فرموده در راه*, *تعق*, the other MSS have *تعقب فرمود و در راه*. I have adopted the latter reading.

⁵ The names are *معدو بیگ فولجین* and *معدو بیگ فوجین* in the MSS. In the lith. ed. it is *هارون بیگ فولجی*, which is incorrect. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is Hindū Bēg without any suffix. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the *Tārīkh-i Gujarāt*, the *Mirāt-i Sikandarī* or the Cambridge History of India.

⁶ The words are *ار مرچل هفتصد ربه* in the MSS and in the lith. ed. *Firishtah* lith. ed. has incorrectly *با هفتصد نفر*, i.e., with seven hundred men, and Col Briggs says that "Hindoo Beg and seven hundred Moguls who entered the fort at night along with his followers." The *Tārīkh-i Gujarāt* (p 17) says the Mughals got into the fort *از طرف راه هفتصد ربه*, i.e. from the direction of the path of the seven hundred steps. The Cambridge History of India (p 331) says, "A division escalated the walls of the fort at night." The *Mirāt-i Sikandarī*

Bahadur was asleep when there was a great noise and the Gujratis in great dismay took the path of flight. Sultān Bahadur with five or six horsemen went away in the direction of Champanūr. Sadr K̲han and Sultan Ālam governor of Raisin and that *suba* took shelter in the citadel of ¹ Sunkar and after two days they asked for assurances of their lives being spared and waited on Jinnat Āshiani. Sadr K̲han was taken into the latter's service but Sultan Ālam as he had been guilty of improper behaviour had by order of Humayun his sinews cut off (i.e. he was hamstrung). Sultan Bahadur sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Champanūr to the port of Dīp and himself went to Kanbayet. When His Majesty Jinnat Āshiani in pursuit of him arrived at the foot of the fort of Champanūr he marched from there and proceeded towards Kanbayet on wings of speed. Sultān Bahadur took ² fresh strong horses and went on to the port of Dīp. His Majesty Humayun arrived at Kanbayet the very day that Bahadur started for Dīp and leaving Kanbayet he ⁴ took possession of Champanūr. Ikhtiyār K̲han Gujrati the governor of the fort occupied himself in defending it but his Majesty Jinnat Āshiani seized it by a ⁵ plan which has been described in the narrative of his history. Ikhtiyār K̲han took shelter in the citadel of the fort which was called Mulha and in the end after praying for quarter acquired the honour of serving His Majesty. As he was distinguished by great excellence and accomplishments above all the other *amirs* of Gujrat he was enlisted among the courtiers of Humayun's special *majlis*.

(Bayley p. 387) ascribes the capture of Mandu to the treachery of Rumi Khan. It says that the latter wrote to Bhupat son of Silhadi who had charge of one of the gates to revenge the wrongs of his family by throwing it open and the Moghals entered by it.

¹ Written as سونکر and سونکھر in the MSS and سونگر in the lith. ed.

One MS and the lith. ed. have سونکھ but the other MS has سونکھل. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted سونکھل in the text edition.

² The actual words are اسنان ناره رور in the MSS as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah but the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat has by mistake اسنان ناره رور.

⁴ The MSS have قتل فرمودند and قتل کردند. The lith. ed. has قتل کرد. I have adopted قتل کردند.

⁵ See *ante* Translation vol. II pp. 54 and 55. See also note 55 page 303.

All the treasures of the Sultāns of Gujrāt, which they had collected in the course of many long generations, fell into his hands and were distributed among the soldiery ¹ by shield-fulls.

As much booty had fallen into the hands of Humāyūn's soldiers, no one that year paid any heed to the collection of the revenue and in the beginning of 910 A.H., in spite of the fact that His Majesty continued to be at Chāmpānī, repeated petitions were sent by the *ra'īyats* of Gujrāt to Sultān Bahādūr, to the effect that if he would appoint one of his ² servants to collect the revenue, the proper amounts would be remitted into the treasury. Sultān Bahādūr deputed his slave 'Imād-ul-mulk who was noted for his great bravery and the excellence of his powers of management, with a large army for ³ collecting the revenue. When 'Imād-ul-mulk began to collect troops, and arrived in front of Ahmadābād, according to a statement about fifty thousand men had already collected round him. From that place he deputed officers to all the neighbouring countries to collect the revenue. When this news reached Jinnat Āshīānī, he ⁴ entrusted the guarding of the treasure to Tardī Bēg Khān, who was one of the great *amīrs*, and a man on whom he reposed his trust and himself advanced towards Ahmadābād. He sent Mīrzā 'Askarī with Yādgar Nāshī Mīrzā and Hindū Bēg one stage in advance of him. In the neighbourhood of Mahmūdābād, which is twelve *karōhs* from Muhammadābād, Mīrzā 'Askarī had a severe battle with 'Imād-ul-mulk, and the latter was defeated, ⁵ and many Gujrātīs were slain.

¹ The words in the MSS are در نه سپردا کریان and در نه سپردا لشکریان. The lith. ed. has با سپردا لشکریان. I have not been able to find out in any other history how the money was measured and distributed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage simply says در نه سپردا لشکریان.

² One MS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have یکی از مالداران, but the other MS. has یکی از متعلقان, I have adopted the former.

³ Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have بتعمیل ولایت فرستاد, but Firishtah in the corresponding passage has بتعمیل مالیات ولایت which is better, and the Tārīkh 1-Gujarāt (p. 25) has بتعمیل مال واحدی.

⁴ According to the Tārīkh 1-Gujarāt (p. 27) the treasure was entrusted to Maulānā Mahmud Lārī who is said to have been احود or tutor, and the fort to Tardī Bēg.

⁵ Firishtah copies the language of the Tabaqāt almost word for word, but here he says عماد الملک شکست یافته با گجراتیان در نه سپردا, from which it

After that His Majesty encamped in front of Ahmadabad and ¹made over the government of that place to Mirza Askari and Pattan Gujrat to Ladgar Naṣir Mirzā and Bahrōj to Qasim Husain Sultān and Baroda to Hindu Beg Qulchīn and Champanir to Tardi Beg Khan and himself went to ²Burhanpur. From there he went to Mandu.

⁴ At this time Khan Jahan Shīrazī who was one of the *amirs* of Sultan Bahadur collected an army and took possession of Nausari and Pūmi Khan having joined him from the port of Sorath they marched towards Bahrōj. Qasim Hosain Sultān finding that he was not strong enough to meet them went to Tardi Beg Khan at Champanir and disturbances and rebellion commenced over the whole of Gujrat. At this time Chadanfar who was one of the *amirs* of Mirzā Askari fled and went to Sultan Bahadur and incited him to advance to Ahmadabad. The details of this ⁵ brief statement have been narrated in their proper place. All the *amirs* ⁶except Tardi Beg Khan now

would appear that Imad ul mull was himself slain though this is not expressly stated anywhere else. The battle and most of the incidents narrated here were narrated previously in the history of Humayun's reign see translation vol II p 57. A rather long account of the battle with some irrelevant matter is given in the Tarikh-i Gujarat (p 27) but the purport of it agrees with that given in the Akbarnama.

¹ This distribution of governments has already been mentioned in the history of Humayun's reign (translation vol II p 58).

² The MSS and the lith ed all have برودرة but I have as before adopted the present spelling Baroda but M Hidayat Hosain has retained برودرة Barodra in the text-edition.

³ The Cambridge History of India page 333 says Humayun marched to Burhanpur. Muhammad Shah or Muhammad Khan Ṭisrī wrote to him to spare his little kingdom and invited the other rulers of the Deccan to form a league for their mutual defence but Humayun's operations were confined to a military promenade through Khandesh.

⁴ See ante translation vol II page 58. The conduct of Rumi Khan contradicts to some extent the accounts given in the Mirat-i Sikandari of his treachery against Sultan Bahadur. The Tarikh-i Gujarat (p 29) describes in some detail how Humayun's governors vacated or were made to vacate their various districts or fiefs.

⁵ See ante translation vol II page 59. The Tarikh-i Gujarat does not appear to mention the incident.

⁶ Both MSS have بعد بردی بنگ حال but the lith ed has بغیر اردی بنگ حال.

assembled in Ahmadābād Sultān Bahādur advanced into ¹ Gujrāt ‘Askarī Mīrzā and Yādgāi Nāsir Mīrzā and all the *amīns* agreed among themselves, that as it was difficult or in fact impossible to meet and withstand him, and as Jinnat Āshīānī was in Mandū, it would be most advisable to seize the treasure which was in Chāmpānī, and advance towards Āgra, and having taken possession of those districts, ² read the public prayer in the name of Mīrzā ‘Askarī At the same time the rank of *vazīr* should belong to Hindū Bēg, and the other *Mīrzās* should go and take possession of any province which they might think of On this decision they relinquished the country of Gujrāt for nothing, Gujrāt which had been acquired with so much trouble and hardship They advanced towards Chāmpānī Tardī Bēg Khān having obtained information of the wicked design of the *Mīrzās* and the other nobles endeavoured to strengthen the fort

³ The *amīns* started from Chāmpānī in the direction of Mālwa and commenced to tread along the desert of disgrace and shameless-

¹ He was at Dīp, which was in Sōrath

² The Cambridge History of India, page 333, says, “‘Askarī Mīrzā at Ahmadābād was meditating his own proclamation as King of Gujarāt” This appears to me to be totally incorrect ‘Askarī Mīrzā and all the other Mughal nobles were giving up the possession of Gujrāt, and were marching towards Āgra He could not, therefore, think of proclaiming himself as the king of Gujrāt He wanted to proclaim himself as *Bādshāh* of Dehlī The Cambridge History of India further goes on to say that Mīrzā ‘Askarī and others besieged Tardī Beg at Chāmpānī This is scarcely correct Neither the *Tabaqāt* nor *Firishtah* says so, and even the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* which gives, on page 31, the negotiations between the *Mīrzās* and Tardī Bēg Khān does not say so The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross is slightly incoherent, for instance, the sentence beginning with دریں ایام and ending with بحالباقی است, on the page referred to is incomplete The punctuation is peculiar There are two marks, a * and a —, and it is not clear what they exactly represent, but whether the sentence referred to ends with بحالباقی است where there is the dash mark or with گرفتاری تو کرده اند, where there is the star mark, there is no verb to ساطع بهادر, and if the sentence begins and ends with the star mark then it curiously jumbles up two totally unconnected matters

³ Both the MSS have no nominative to the verb شروع کردی, but the lith ed had امرا, and *Firishtah* in the corresponding passage has میررایان I have adopted the reading of the lith ed

ness When Sultān Bahadur found Gujrat unguarded he advanced towards Champanūr to crush Tardī Beg Khan The latter took with him such portion of the treasure of Chāmpanūr as he could and commenced to retrace his steps to Āgrā Sultān Bahadur halted at Champanūr for ten days and occupied himself in arranging the affairs of that neighbourhood As in the times of the power of Jinnat Āshiani he had owing to his great distress and weakness asked for help from the *firangis* he knew for certain that they would come and knowing that the ports of Gujrat were unguarded and being afraid that they should come under the possession of the *firangis* he started from Champanūr and advanced towards Sōrath and Junagarh so that on the arrival of the *firangis* he might turn them back by any means that might be possible ¹He had been engaged for some days in travelling about and hunting when news came that five or

¹ The circumstances attending Sultan Bahadur's death are given in the different histories in a way which mainly agrees with the text Firihātah copies it almost word for word Col Briggs (vol IV pp 13 -141) reduces the number of Europeans to four or five thousand but otherwise agrees He however gives extracts from Bariahe Souza's History of the Portuguese in Asia and also from the Mirat Iskandry to give the two opposite versions of the incidents connected with Sultan Bahadur's death The Portuguese version shows that Nuno de Cunha who commanded at Goa but who having been informed by Emanuel de Souza who commanded at Diu had come to the latter place were both convinced that Badur intended to seize and put them to death and to secure the fort of Diu which he when hard pressed by Humayun had given them permission to build and they were also contriving to seize him put him to death As to the actual occurrence the Portuguese version is that Emanuel de Souza was going to invite the king to the fort

He came up with the king's barge and made the offer (invitation?) by means of Rume Cham (رومی حلی) The latter cautioned the king but he slighted the warning and invited Emanuel de Souza to come into his barge The latter when doing so fell into the sea but was pulled up and taken to the king At the same time another Portuguese barge came up with some gentlemen on board who seeing Emanuel de Souza hastily got into the king's barge The king suspecting their sudden coming on board and remembering the caution given by Rume Cham ordered his officers to kill Emanuel de Souza James de Mesquita understanding it flew at and wounded the king Emanuel de Souza was killed and there was a bloody fray Finally Badur attempted to escape by swimming but he was in danger of drowning Then Tristan de Payva de Santarem reached out an oar to him to take him on board

six thousand *fiṅgīs* had arrived in *gharābs*. When they arrived at the port of Dīp, and heard of the restoration of Sultān Bahādur to power, and of the return of His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī, they became ashamed and repentant about their coming. They agreed among themselves, that by any deception that might be possible they should take possession of Dīp. Their chief, in accordance with this plan, feigned illness and spread a report about it. His object was that he might not have an interview with Sultān Bahādur. The latter sent men one after another to summon him, and got (the same) reply. In the end thinking that the *fiṅgīs* were afraid of him he got into a barge, with a small number of men, to go and reassure them. The *fiṅgīs* finding the opportunity which they had been seeking, planned to act treacherously. The Sultān perceiving this, tried to get back into his barge. At the time when he was stepping into it, from the *gharāb* of the *fiṅgīs*, the latter separated the two vessels, and the Sultān being unable to get into his own barge fell into the sea, and having sunk once, put his head out of the water. At this time one of the *fiṅgīs* struck him with a spear and drowned him. The Gujrāt army returned without any delay to Ahmadābād, and the

when a soldier struck him across the face with a halbert, and so others, till he was killed.

The Mirut Iskundry's account is different. According to it the Portuguese built a fort at Dīū after obtaining Bahadur Shah's permission to build an enclosure on a *hide* of land, but they cut the cow hide into narrow strips and enclosed a large area on which they built a strong fort. When Bahadur was restored to power, he began to think of a stratagem to expel them and the Portuguese becoming aware of his intention became suspicious. When he came to the neighbourhood of Dīū, he sent one Noor Mahomed Khuleel to the Portuguese chief with instructions to persuade the latter to come and visit the king. The envoy when drinking with the Portuguese chief divulged the king's real intentions to the latter. The Portuguese chief told him that he was unable to go on account of his indisposition. The king determined to go on board the Portuguese chief's barge on the plea of inquiring about his health, but really with the object of allaying his suspicions. When he got on board, the Portuguese, according to a pre conceived plan, cut him and his companions down. The date of the murder is given as 3rd Rumzan, 943 A H, 14th February, 1537 A D.

The Cambridge History of India, page 334, gives 13th February, 1537, as the date of Sultān Bahādur's death.

port of Dip came into the possession of the *frangis*. This event happened in the month of Ramadan in the year 943 A.H.

The period of Sultan Bahadur's reign was eleven years and nine months.

A NARRATIVE OF MIRĀN MUHAMMAD SHĀH RULER OF ĀSIR AND BURNĀNPŪR

When Sultan Bahadur packed up the goods of existence his mother Makhduma-i-Jahan and the *amirs* who had been attending on his stirrups retraced their steps from Dip to Ahmadabad. On the way intelligence reached them that Muhammad Zaman Mirza whom Sultan Bahadur had in the time of the disturbances sent towards Delhi and Lahore that he might create disturbances in northern India and cause dissensions in the Chaghtai army had returned from the neighbourhood of Lahore and had arrived at Ahmadabad. Immediately on hearing of the martyrdom of Sultan Bahadur he commenced weeping and making much lamentation and changed his dress &c. put on mourning and started towards Dip in order to offer his condolence. When he joined the camp Makhduma-i-Jahan as far as lay in her power sent the necessary articles for his entertainment and made him put off his mourning garb.³ But that fortunate Mirza made his inquiries into the circumstances

¹ One MS. has only eleven years but the other MSS. and the lith. ed. have eleven years and nine months.

The heading is partly obliterated in one MS. In the other it is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. has *میران محمد شاه* between *دکتر* and *حکومت* and substitutes *حاکم* for *والی*.

³ The *Tabaqat* and *Firishtah* confine themselves to the above narrative of Muhammad Zaman Mirza's misdeeds but the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* and the *Tarikh-i-Gujarāt* say that he attempted to usurp the throne of Gujarat. Their accounts are however different. According to the *Mirāt-i-Sikandari* Bayley page 400 he went to the apartments of the Sultan's wives and after offering many condolences he urged that they should adopt him as a son and help him. The ladies said that they never interfered in politics and the question of the Sultan's successor should be settled by the ministers. When his pretensions became known the *amirs* decided that the task of putting him down must have precedence of all other matters and should be entrusted to Imad ul Mulk. There was some opposition to the latter part of the plan by Afzal Khan. Imad ul Mulk however started with a large army for Sorath and when he reached

of the Sultān's mother, and showed his kindness towards her, in this (strange) way, that at the time of his departure he made an attack on the treasury and carried away from it according to a reputed statement, seven hundred chests of gold, and went away to a distance, and twelve thousand horsemen, Mughals and Hindūstānīs collected round him.

The *amīrs* of Gujrāt became perturbed on beholding this new disturbance, and took counsel with one another about the choice of a *bādshāh*. As Sultān Bahādur had repeatedly expressed his intention of making Mūrān Muhammad Shāh, who was his nephew (sister's son), his heir,¹ everyone agreed to select him as the Sultān, and had

the neighbourhood of U'nah the Mīrzā came out and bravely offered battle, but was defeated and was obliged to take refuge in exile.

The *Tārīkh* i Gujarāt (pp 36-39) says that Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā hastened to Dīb, that he might take his revenge of Sultān Bahādur's murder from the *frānqīs*. He then seized the treasure which was being brought from Dīb and took possession of it, and, according to the account which is generally believed, there were nine hundred chests of gold. He also had the public prayer read in his own name at Dīb. When this news reached Ahmadābād, the *amīrs* determined to vacate Ahmadābād, and go away to different places. At this juncture 'Imād ul mulk came to the *maylis* and demanded of Afdal Khān and Ikhtiyār Khān, who were the *valīls* of the Sultān, what they intended to do. On hearing their views he reproached them that they could think of lowering their heads before Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā. They say that the people of Gujarāt were too weak to meet the army, which Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā had raised with the treasure he had robbed. He exhorted them to remain quietly at Ahmadābād and allow him to deal with Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā. They agreed. He had at that time only nine horsemen with him. He started from Ahmadābād, and halted at 'Uṭhmānpūr, and made a proclamation of the grant of *jāqīr*, etc. to the soldiers. Within one month he had forty thousand horsemen. He then marched against Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā. The latter however took shelter in an entrenchment. His *valīl*, and the commander of this army Hī-ām ud dīn Mirak, son of Mīr Khālifa, offered battle, and on the 3rd day when he was fighting, Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā escaped from the entrenchment, and fled to Sind.

The Cambridge History of India, pp 334, 335, says that Muhammad Zamān Mīrzā claimed the throne of Gujarāt on the ground that Sultān Bahādur's mother had adopted him but says nothing further about what happened to him later.

¹ Firīshṭah agrees generally, and so does the *Mīrāt* i Sikandarī. The *Tārīkh* i-Gujarāt, however, says that while the *amīrs* were engaged in discussing

the *khutba* read and the *siḥla* struck in his name in his absence. They sent swift messengers to bring him. They also nominated ¹ Imad ul mulk with a large army for the destruction of Muhammad Zaman Mirza. The latter fought with him and was defeated.

Miran Muhammad Shah whom Sultān Bahadur had sent as far as Malwa in pursuit of the Chaghtai army died of natural causes a month and half after the *khutba* had been read in his name.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD SHĀH SON OF LATIF KHAN SON OF MUZAFFAR SHĀH

As Miran Muhammad Shah Farūqī passed away from the evil place of the world to the well filled land of the after world and ² except

the matter of Muhammad Zaman Mirza ambassadors came from Miran Muhammad Shah demanding the kingdom on the ground of his appointment by Sultan Bahadur to be his successor and on that of his right of inheritance and kingship

¹ See note 3 page 381

² One MS. and the lith. ed. here call him Muhammad Zaman but the other MS. prefixes Mirza to the name and adds retired to the country of Sind.

³ Both MSS. have معد but the lith. ed. has معمر. Firishtah lith. ed. also has معمر. The Cambridge History of India page 33 in order I suppose to be original and quaint calls Mahmud Khan the last remaining heir of Muhammad Karim instead of calling the latter Sultan Muhammad or Sultan Muhammad I. The Cambridge History of India also says that Mubarak II who had succeeded his brother in Khandesh and had almost certainly hoped to receive a summons to the throne of Gujarat would not surrender him until a force led by Ikhtiyar Khan invaded Khandesh. It appears to me that there are several mistakes in this sentence. In the first place Mubarak II did not succeed his father. The latter was succeeded by his infant son and after the latter had been put to death by Mubarak he ascended the throne of Khandesh. In the second place there is no evidence to show that he had hoped to be summoned to the throne of Gujarat. Even the Tarikh-i Gujarat which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross who is also the author of Chapter XIII of the Cambridge History of India does not say so. The Tarikh-i Gujarat (p. 39) says that the emissaries from Khandesh claimed the throne of Gujarat for the infant son of Miran Muhammad Shah but Mubarak II who had put that infant son to death would hardly have the face to claim the throne of Gujarat or had the hardihood to expect a summons to it. And finally it does not appear that Ikhtiyar Khan had to lead a force into Khandesh. He did not even go there. Mahmud Khan was according to the testimony of all the historians brought to Gujarat by Ikhtiyar Khan's brother Muqbil Khan. According to the Tarikh-i

Mahmūd Khān, son of Latīf Khān, son of Sultān Muzaffar, there was no heir left to the throne, and he was imprisoned in the custody of Mīrān Muhammad Shāh by order of Sultān Muzaffar, the *amīrs* of Gujāt sent a man to summon him. ¹ Muhammad Shāh's son raised objections about sending him. The *amīrs* of Gujāt collected an army, and decided to march to Burhānpūr, and ² he (apparently the son of Mīrān Muhammad Shāh) becoming aware of this sent Mahmūd Khān to Gujāt. He was placed on the throne of Gujāt on the ³ 10th Dhī-hijja, 944 A H = 10th May, 1538 A D, with the title

Gujarāt, as also according to the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah*, there was a threat of an army being sent to Burhānpūr, and the *Tārīkh-i Gujarāt* only adds that tents were sent out.

It is, however, true, as Col Briggs (vol IV, p 144) says that a Guzerat chief marched to Boorhanpooi to invite Mahmood to the capital.

¹ It appears from the *Mīrāt-i Sikandarī* that Mīrān Muhammad Shāh's son was an infant at the time of his father's death. He was, however, placed by the ministers on the throne, and they determined to put Mubārak Khān Muhammad Shāh's brother to death, lest he should rebel against his nephew. They accordingly had him brought to Burhānpūr and made him over to a nobleman of the name of 'Arab Khān. He, however, gained the latter over, and with his help attacked the palace, and placed his nephew in confinement. He then told the *amīrs* that the regency belonged of right to him. They knew that they were helpless. He then put his nephew to death, and was proclaimed as Mubārak Shāh (Bayley, pp 404, 405).

The *Tārīkh-i Gujarāt* (pp 39, 40) says that the ambassadors came to Gujarāt, and demanded that as *Lhutha* had been read in the name of Mīrān Muhammad Shāh, it should be read also in the name of his son. The Gujarāt *amīrs* did not agree to this argument and pointed out that as Mahmūd Khān was living in safety in the fort of Bīāwal, they should send him to Gujarāt. They also appointed Muqbil Khān, brother of Ikhtiyār Khān, to bring him, and threatened, that, if he was not sent, they would march to Burhānpūr. When Muqbil Khān went there, Mahmūd Khān was made over to him.

² *Firishtah* says that it was Mīrān Mubārak Shāh, brother of Mīrān Muhammad Shāh, who raised objection to the sending of Mahmūd Khān. See also the preceding note.

³ The Cambridge History of India, page 335, mentions August 8th, 1587, as the date of the accession. I suppose this is a misprint, for otherwise it is incorrect by 59 or 60 years. The date given in the text agrees with that of *Firishtah*. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 144), however, makes it "10th Zeekad 944 A H, April 5th 1538". The Cambridge History of India also gives the new Sultān the title of Sa'd-ud-dīn Mahmūd Shāh III. This may be correct, but I have seen it nowhere else, and no other *bādshāh* of Gujāt had the first name ending in *dīn*.

of Mahmud Shah ¹ Ikhtiyār Khan Gujrātī who had gone to Burhanpur to bring him became all powerful and the reins of the affairs of the kingdom came into his grasp of power

² After a few months in the year 945 A.H. the *amirs* fell out amongst themselves Daryā Khan and Imad ul mulk united together and put Ikhtiyār Khan to death Imad ul mulk became *Amir ul umara* and Daryā Khan the *amir* ³ At the end of that year enmity appeared between them also Daryā Khan took Sultan Mahmud out of the city on the pretext of a hunting excursion and went away in the direction of Champānir When Imad ul mulk

¹ Firihstah al o says that it was Ikhtiyār Khan who went to Burhanpur but see note 1 page 384 from which it would appear that it was his brother Muqbil Khan who went Col Briggs also says that it was Mokbil Khan

² The word *جور* is omitted in one MS

³ Firihstah agrees generally but he calls Daryā Khan Daryā Khan Churi and he calls Imad ul mulk a *jagir* Siramgaon and Surat Col Briggs does not say that Imad ul mulk and Daryā Khan combined together and put Ikhtiyār Khan to death but he says Yekhtiar Khan lost his life in an affray The *Mirat i Sikandar* Bayley pages 407 408 gives a circumstantial account of how Ikhtiar Khan was killed According to it the young Sultan was kept practically in confinement by Ikhtiar Khan Mukbil Khan and the latter's son Lad Khan He was dissatisfied but feigned to be totally indifferent Lad Khan one day proposed to him that if he would give the word he would so manage that Daria Khan and Imad ul Mull would go to retire behind the veil of death The Sultan at once rode to the house of Imad ul Mulik and the latter and Daria Khan went to the palace and Ikhtiar Khan Mukbil Khan and Lad Khan were all hanged in front of the audience hall Ikhtiar Khan protesting his innocence to the last moment

The account given in the *Tarikh i Gujarat* (pp 41 42) is not very clear but according to it there was a quarrel between Ikhtiyār Khan and Imad ul mulk and Daryā Khan because the young Sultan was kept in charge of Ikhtiyār Khan's brother Muqbil Khan Imad ul mulk and Daryā Khan charged Ikhtiyār Khan with disloyalty to the Sultan and with conspiring with the ruler of Burhanpur He stoutly denied it but they appeared to have wrung his neck and buried his body in the garden of the palace where the quarrel took place

The Cambridge History of India page 345 seems partially to follow this version

⁴ As to the quarrel between Imad ul mulk and Daryā Khan all the histories appear to agree It appears that most of the nobles were on the side of Daryā Khan and Imad ul mulk was deserted by them and by the army he had collected and so had to give n

became aware of these happenings, he began at once to collect his forces, and opening his hands for lavish gifts, got an immense army together, and advanced towards Chāmpānī. After two or three months most of the Gujrātī soldiers, who had obtained large sums of money from him, separated from him and united with the Sultān. 'Imād-ul-mulk in his distress agreed to an amicable settlement, and it was settled that 'Imād-ul-mulk should go away to Jhālāwār, and some *parganas* of Sōrath which were in his *jāgīr*, and the Sultān should return to his capital of Ahmadābād.

Again in the year 949 A.H. Daryā Khān advanced towards the country of Sōrath, taking Sultān Mahmūd and a well-equipped army with him, in order to extirpate 'Imād-ul-mulk. The latter came forward to meet him, but after a battle fled and went as a suppliant to Mīrān Mubārak Shāh, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr. Sultān Mahmūd advanced towards Burhānpūr in pursuit of him. Mīrān Mubārak Shāh assembled his army and came forward to aid 'Imād-ul-mulk. He encountered the Gujrāt army in the battlefield, but was defeated. 'Imād-ul-mulk then fled from Burhānpūr, and took shelter with Qādir Shāh, the ruler of Mālwa. ¹ Mīrān Mubārak Shāh sought the intervention of the great men of the age, and coming in by the door of peace rendered homage to Sultān Mahmūd. Daryā Khān acquired much power and strength owing to the departure of 'Imād-ul-mulk, and took upon himself the performance of all matters and affairs of the government and revenue administration, and allowed no one else to interfere in them. Gradually things came to such a pass that he made Sultān Mahmūd a puppet and acted himself as the *bādshāh*. Then one night, in concert with ² Jarjū, a pigeon fancier, the Sultān

¹ The reason for Mīrān Mubārak Shāh's asking for peace, and doing homage to Sultān Mahmūd is explained by Firishtah, who says *سالمی معہ، و د شہ چوں* *در حاندیش فرو،* i.e., Sultān Mahmūd invaded Khāndēsh, and occupied himself in plundering and ravaging (the country).

² The name is given as *حر و کنور*, and *حرسو کنور نار* in the MSS., and *حر و کھوکر کنور نار* in the lith. ed. It is *حر دیو کنور نار* in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The name does not appear to be mentioned in the *Tārīkh-i Gujārāt*. In the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*, Bayley, page 416, the man is called Jarjī the bird catcher, and the Cambridge History of India, page 337, has Chirjī a fowler. I have adopted Jarjū, a pigeon fancier. The way in which the Sultān fled

came out of the citadel of the fort of Ahmadabad and went to Ālam Khān Lūdī who held Dulqa and Dānduqa as his *jagir*

¹ Ālam Khān Lūdī considering the advent of the Sultān a great honour collected his troops and four thousand horsemen gathered round him. Darya Khān brought forward a boy of unknown descent and gave him the title of Sultān Muzaffar Shāh and collected the army of Gujrat. He brought the commanders of the army over to his side by promising to increase their *jagirs* and add to their titles and advanced towards Dulqa. Ālam Khān came forward and met him and ² a great battle raged between the two armies. At the first onset however Ālam Khān defeated the vanguard of Darya Khān's army and advancing into his special detachment fought with great gallantry and courage. But when he came out of the battlefield there

to Ālam Khān is described in almost identical word in the *Tabaqat* and *Firishtah*. The *Mirāt-i Sikandari* Bayley page 416 gives a circumstantial account which differs in various particulars from that in the *Tabaqat*. The *Tarikh-i Gujarat* gives some account of what happened before the flight but does not say anything about the flight itself. The *Cambridge History of India* is account is somewhat different *معرکه* in the text edition.

¹ One MS has *معمر عالم حل* but the other MS and the lith ed have *عالم حان لودی*. *Firishtah* also has *عالم حان لودی* and I have adopted it.

طفل معبول النسي is the description in the MSS and in the lith ed. The lith ed of *Firishtah* has *مقبول النسي*. The *Tarikh-i Gujarat* has *ارسله سلطان احمد بابي احمد آبا* and the *Mirāt-i Sikandari* Bayley page 417 describes the boy as a descendant of Sultan Ahmad the founder of Ahmadabad. The *Cambridge History of India* calls him a child of obscure origin. It appears that Darya Khān was willing to give up his position and in fact sent in his resignation but was overruled by Fattujī Muḥiẓ Khān who was a relation of his and a man of much experience and then he produced the pretender and marched out to meet Ālam Khān and Sultan Mahmud (p. 338).

³ The account of the battle as given in the *Mirāt-i Sikandari* is entirely different. According to it Darya Khān was victorious and took possession of Dholkha and both the Sultan and Ālam Khān fled. After their defeat however large bodies of troops joined him and Darya Khān found his army dwindling away. He attempted to enter Ahmadabad but the people shut the gate in his face and attacked him with arrows and musket fire. Then the Sultan and Ālam Khān advanced to Ahmadabad. Darya Khān sent his family and treasures to Champanir and went himself to Burhanpur to bring Miran Mubarak Shah as his ally.

were no more than five horsemen with him, and he could not find Sultān Mahmūd, whom he had left with his own troops at the gate. He became perplexed and distressed, but it came into his mind that as after the first attack the vanguard of Daryā Khān's army had fled and gone away towards Ahmadābād, the news of his defeat might have been spread about in the city, and he should therefore betake himself there. Then with the five men who were with him he advanced to Ahmadābād, and going to the royal palace made a proclamation of his victory. When the citizens saw 'Ālam Khān, as they had seen some of the fugitives belonging to (Daryā Khān's) vanguard a moment before, they became sure of Daryā Khān's defeat. They came in a large ¹ body, and waited on him. He gave an order, and in a moment the people plundered Daryā Khān's house and having strengthened the gates of the city, sent swift messengers to bring Sultān Mahmūd. The messengers from Ahmadābād came to Daryā Khān, who had after gaining the victory (over the troops that were opposed to him), halted in his camp, and informed him of what was happening at Ahmadābād. He then advanced towards that city. As the families of the *amīns* were in the city, which was in the possession of 'Ālam Khān, most of them separated from Daryā Khān before he arrived there. About this time Sultān Mahmūd also arrived. Daryā Khān then fled towards Burhānpūr and matters turned ² upside down. Daryā Khān did not find a resting place at Burhānpūr, and went to Shēr Khān Afghān, and ³ was received with favour by him. After the departure of Daryā Khān, 'Ālam Khān took up the post and the work of the *vazārat*. But he also, owing to his great pride, wanted

¹ One MS. has *ءاعءءء* while the other has *ءاعءء* and the lith. ed. has *ءاعءءء*. Firishtah also has *ءاعءءء* but I prefer *ءاعءءء*.

² The words are *ءوءءءءءءءء*. There are no similar words in Firishtah and the *Tārīkh* i-Gujarāt. I think the meaning is, that Daryā Khān had defeated Mirān Mubārak Shāh, and the latter had to sue for peace. The tables were now turned, and Daryā Khān had to go and seek shelter in Burhānpūr.

³ Firishtah and the *Tārīkh* i-Gujarāt also say so. The latter says he entered the service of Shēr Khān, but the Cambridge History of India, page 339, gives an account of some of his further adventures, and of an unsuccessful attempt made by him and 'Ālam Khān Lodī, who according to the Cambridge History of India had now joined him to place 'Alā-ud-dīn Fath Khān of the royal line of Sind on the throne of Gujarāt.

to be independent and overbearing like Darya Khan in all respects. Sultān Mahmud got the *amirs* to combine with him and attempted to seize him. He received warning of this and fled and went to Sher Khan. After his mind had been set at rest by the termination of the dissensions of the rebel *amirs* Sultān Mahmud set himself to manage the government of the country to increase the cultivation and to comfort the soldiers. Within a short time he restored the country to its original condition. He treated the nobles and other great men and the gentry and pious men with kindness and favour. He carried on the government till the year 961 A.H. without any dissension and any enemy.

¹ But in the month of Rabi ul awwal of that year one of his servants who had the name of Burhan and who showed himself to be a man of piety in the eyes of men and devoted most of his time in prayer and worship and always acted as the Sultān's *pesh nama* or leader in the prayers in a hunting excursion murdered him. The particulars of this brief statement are these: on one occasion the Sultān shut him up between walls on account of some fault committed by him in his service and left an aperture for his breath to pass

¹ Before mentioning the assassination of Sultān Mahmud Firri hitah mention the foundation of the new city of Mahmud bad which however could not be completed by the Sultān and also the erection of the fort of Surat under the supervision of Chhadanfar Āqī his Turkī slave who had the title of Khudwand Khan. The Tārīkh-i Gujarat says that Humayun after his restoration wrote a letter to Sultān Mahmud proposing an alliance and suggesting that Sultān Mahmud should invade Malwa while he himself would advance against others whom he rather vaguely describes as *مغالل باعی* or rebellious enemies. Accordingly Sultān Mahmud took a muster roll of his troops and *حادر بر سر* *مندر ردد* which I suppose mean invaded Mandu (pp 43-44). The Mirat-i Sikandari has a long account of Sultān Mahmud's liking for low company and of his conferring the title of Muhafz Khan on Jarji the pigeon fancier and of this man's insolence towards the *amirs* and his getting a *farman* from the Sultān for the execution of Ala'ud-din Lodi and Shujat Khan. The *amirs* then demanded that Jarji should be made over to them. The Sultān refused to do so. The *amirs* pretended to accept the Sultān's order but prayed that he would allow them to make their obeisance to him. The Sultān held a *darbar* and when Jarji appeared there he was murdered in open *darbar* in the Sultān's presence. The *amirs* then made a plan for guarding the Sultān and later of blinding him and dividing the kingdom among themselves (Bayley pp 491-4-3).

through, but after a time released him. The wretched Burhān kept this old grudge concealed in his mind. He united with himself a number of hunters, whose occupation was to hunt tigers, and promised each one of them the rank of an *amīr*. One night when the Sultān had gone to sleep after coming back from hunting, he in concert with his nephew (sister's son) named Daulat, who was in close attendance on the Sultān, tied ¹ the latter's hair firmly to the wood of his bedstead, and passed a sword across his throat. That victim (of then cruelty) had placed both his hands on the edge of the sword, so that his hands were also cut, and he was murdered. (Burhān then) kept the tiger hunters hidden in a corner and sent men to summon the great *amīrs*. He also told the musicians that the Sultān had ordered that they should play on their instruments outside the house.

Half the night had passed when he secured the attendance of Khudāwand Khān and Āṣaf Khān, who were both the *vazīrs*, and took them to a private chamber, and had them murdered. In the same way he summoned twelve of the great *amīrs* and killed them all. Then his men went to summon I'tmād Khān. The latter said, "The Sultān cannot possibly have sent for me at such a time, I have only a little while ago come from attending on him", and he delayed in coming. Burhān sent another man to summon him. His suspicion and alarm became greater, and he did not come. When Afdal Khān, who was one of the distinguished *amīrs* and with whom Burhān had ancient friendship came, Burhān took him to a private place, and told him, "The Sultān is displeased with Khudāwand Khān and Āṣaf Khān, and wants you to take their place, and he has sent this robe of the *vazīrat* for you." Afdal Khān said, "Until I go to the Sultān's presence and see him, I shall not put on the robe." Burhān then took Afdal Khān to the place, where the martyred Sultān was lying, and said, "I have killed the Sultān and the *vazīrs* and all the nobles. I now make you my *vazīr*,

¹ The accounts of the murder as given in Firishtah and the Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt and the Mirāt-i-Sikandarī and the Cambridge History of India agree mainly with that in the text, but there are various differences in details. It was committed on the night of the 12th of Rabī'ul āwwal the anniversary of the birth of the Prophet Muhammad. The murderer is called Burhān in all the histories, except the Cambridge History of India where he is called Burhān-ud dīn (p. 342).

and will entrust all the power to you. Afdal Khan commenced calling him names and made an outcry. That wicked man then murdered him also. He then conferred titles on each one of a number of obscure soldiers and vulgar men who came that night and gave them hopes of being made *amirs*. He stretched his hands to the public treasure and gave much gold to the people. He was occupied till the morning with the giving away of the gold and in the morning placed the royal umbrella over his head and made a general proclamation. He then collected all the elephants belonging to the Sultan which were in the city and having distributed the horses in the Sultan's stables among the people of the lower classes made them the supports of his power. When it became morning the news of the Sultan's martyrdom spread about. Imad ul mulk the father of Chengiz Khan and Ulugh Khan Hahshi and other *amirs* collected together and attacked that man of wretched destiny. He in accordance with the line

Hemistich

Empire if even for a moment is precious

had the royal umbrella raised over his head and came to oppose them with a mob of common people and a few elephants and at the first assault fell on the dust of wretchedness and was slain by Sherwan Khan. A rope was then tied round his leg and he was dragged about all round the *biwar* and in different parts of the city.

The period of the reign of Sultan Mahmūd was eighteen years and two months and odd days.

It so happened that Islam Khan son of Shēr Khan the ruler of Dehli and Nizam ul mulk Bahri the ruler of Ahmadnagar died during this year by natural death and a poet has composed the following couplets giving the date of their death

¹ The manner in which Burhān met his fate is described in much the same manner in *Lishtiāh* and the other histories. The account in the *Tārīkh-i Gujrat* (p. 40) is very circumstantial. The encounter with Sherwan Khan is somewhat differently narrated in the *Mirāt-i Sikandari*.

² According to *Lishtiāh* the year was 961 A.H. and his own father Maulana Chulām Ali Hindu Shah was the writer of the couplets. The couplet are also given in the *Tārīkh-i Gujrat* but the name of the author is not mentioned there and there are slight variations in the wording (p. 49).

Couplets

Three sovereigns died in the course of a year,
 Through their justice, was *Hind* (India) the seat of peace
 One Mahmūd Shāh, of Gujrāt Sultān,
 Who like his grandeur, youthful was,
 The other Islām Khān of Dehli Sultān,
 Who in his reign, was a Lord of Conjunction great
 The third was Nizam-ul-mulk Bahrī,
 Who in the Deccan, held sovereign sway
 Of the date of the death of these sovereigns three
 If they ask thee 't was "the death of monarchs great"

Sultān Mahmūd was ¹ a virtuous ruler, and possessed pleasant manners. He spent most of his time in the society of learned and pious men, and on great days, such as the day of the death of His Holiness the Prophet, may the blessings of God and His peace be on him ¹ and on the dates of the deaths of his own ancestors, and on other auspicious days, he gave food to *faqīrs* and other deserving persons. He held the ewer and the basin in his own hand and washed the hands of the men. ² And *sarīsāf* and all pieces of cloth, which were intended for his own garments, were first made into ³ tablecloths for *darwīshes* and *faqīrs*, and afterwards fashioned into wearing apparel for him.

¹ The actual words are بادشاه بیک بهاد و پندیده اطوار بود

² The readings in the MSS and in the lith ed are unintelligible at this place. The MSS have و بارچهائی صراماف و هر بارچه. The lith ed has the same with the exception that instead of صراماف it has سرساف. The corresponding passage in Firishtah has و بارچههای سرساماف که بجهت پوشش او مقرر بود. This makes sense. It means the *sarīsāf* and other kinds of cloth, which were intended for garments for his own use, were first made into turbans and garments for the *darwīshes*, etc. Firishtah has been followed in the text edition except that بود has been changed to بودی.

³ One MS and the lith ed have دستار خان, but the other MS has دستار حوان, but see the preceding note, from which it will appear that in the corresponding passage Firishtah has دستار و حمامه.

At a distance of twelve *karohs* from Ahmadabad he laid the foundation of the city to which he gave the name of ¹ Mahmudabad and built an arcaded *basar* from Ahmadabad to that place. He also established a deer park on the bank of the stream called *- Khari nadi* and built a wall of burnt bricks adorned with turrets for a distance of seven ² *karohs*. In this deer park he erected beautiful structures at different places and various kinds of animals were allowed to roam about free in the park and they increased and multiplied by breeding in it. As he was very fond of the society of women he collected a large number of them in his harem. He always hunted and played *chaugan* in the deer park with them. The trees in it were wrapped in red and green velvet. There were many pleasant gardens in it and handsome women were engaged in attending to them.

Whenever any of the women in his harem became pregnant he ordered that she should have a miscarriage and did not allow any of them to have a male child. He had made I'tmad Khan the attendant of his harem and had directed him to attend to the direction of the ladies. I'tmad Khan had by way of prudence and caution destroyed his own virility by eating camphor. The writer of this book has on various occasions visited the deer park and the buildings in it.

As visits to the tomb (of holy men) by the women and their gathering together on various ⁴ pretexts had become extremely common in Gujrat and immorality and licentiousness had become as it were a matter of habit and custom and there was (in the opinion of the people) no wickedness in such conduct Sultan Mahmud forbade the going of women to these places and their going and coming during days and nights to the houses of people. He also

¹ The town had been built by his ancestor Mahmud Begarha and Sultan Mahmud III took up his residence in it and restored and enlarged it.

² M. Hidayat Hosain has کهار بدی in the text edition.

³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have the words دهلی را between هعب کروزه and دیوار ار حسب معند.

⁴ One MS. has حانه instead of بهانه.

gave money to ¹ some, and sent them to procure women, and when they brought them before him, he ordered them to be punished and in this way he ² effectively stopped such acts

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN AHMAD

When Sultān Mahmūd became a martyr and left no son behind him, I'timād Khān, in order to prevent the bursting out of the flames of disorder and disturbance, produced a ³ boy of tender years by the

¹ One MS and the lith ed have ^١ به بعضی, but the other MS has مردم which appears to me to be better, and has been adopted in the text edition

² The actual words are ^٢ بسوئترین و جہی سدّ اس باب کردہ بود, which translated literally, would be, had in the best way closed this door. The MSS have ^٣ حوئتر, but the lith ed has سوئترین

³ This is the heading in the MS. The lith ed has ذکر سلطنت احمد شاہ

⁴ This is the account in the MSS and in the lith ed. Firishtah, however, says that it was Razī-ul mulk, who produced the youth, who was a descendant of Ahmad Shāh II. The Mirāt-i-Sikandari (Bayley, pp 454, 455) says, that after the death of Sultān Mahmūd, the *amīrs* inquired of I'timād Khān, who was fully acquainted with the late Sultān's domestic affairs, whether the latter had left a son behind him. On his answering in the negative, they inquired whether any of his widows was expecting a child. This also he answered in the negative. They then inquired, whether there was any relative of the Sultān, who was fit to succeed to the throne. He said there was a youth of the name of Ahmad Khān who was living in Ahmadābād. Rezi-ul-Mulk was accordingly sent in a cart with very fast horses. He found Ahmad Khān buying some grain at a shop near his house, and recognising him, brought him at once to Mahmūdābād. The account in the Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt (pp 49, 50) agrees, except that it says that the nobles wanted to know from I'timād Khān if the late Sultān had even left a daughter behind, so that they might place her on the throne. Here again the answer was in the negative. Then it became necessary to enquire about distant relations, so Radī ul mulk, one of the descendants of Ahmad Shāh, the founder of Ahmad ābād, who was five or six generations below him, and was a youth in his twelfth year, was brought forward.

It will be seen that there is considerable amount of divergence among the four historians, who were more or less contemporaneous with the events which they were describing. According to the author of the Mirāt i Sikandari, whose father Shaikh Mahmūd, commonly called Shaikh Mānjhū, was the manager of Saiyid Mubārak's affairs, the name of the youth, who was selected to be the Sultān, was Ahmad Khān, and Razī-ul-Mulk was the name of the man who was sent to bring him from Ahmadābād. Firishtah appears to agree, though

name Radī ul mulk describing him as a descendant of Sultān Ahmad the founder of Ahmadābād and in concert with ¹ Miran Sayyid Mubarak Bukhari and the other *amirs* who had escaped with their lives from the sword of the ungrateful Burhan placed him on the throne of empire and gave him the title of Ahmad Shah. They comforted the *amirs* by confirming their *jagirs*. Itmad Khan kept the affairs of the kingdom in his own hand and left the newly chosen Sultān nothing but the name and having obtained the whole power kept him (confined) in his house.

When five years had passed in this way Sultān Ahmad unable any longer to remain in this state got out of Ahmadabad and went to Mahmudabad to Sayyid Mubarak Bukhari who was one of the great *amirs*. Musa Khan Guladi and Sadat Khan and Alam Khan Ludi and other men collected round him. Shaukh Yusuf also went and joined him. The Sultān conferred on him the title of Āzam Humayun. Itmad Khan in concert with Imad ul mulk father of Chengiz Khan and Ulugh Khan and Juhhar Khan Habshi and Ikhtiyar ul mulk and other *amirs* of Gujrat with a part of artillery attacked Sayyid Mubarak. The latter although he had a smaller army than Itmad Khan arrayed his troops to meet him in battle. When the battle began a ² cannon ball struck Sayyid Mubarak and he was slain and Sultān Ahmad was defeated. He wandered

he does not give the name of the youth who was raised to the throne but the *Tabaqat* and the *Tarikh* of Gujarat say that it was Radī ul mulk who was placed on the throne.

The Cambridge History of India (p. 343) does not mention these differences but in its own confident way gives a narrative which differs in some particulars from all of them. It says that one Khalil Shah was at first reported to be a son of the murdered Sultān but on enquiry he could not be produced and the writer surmises that there was a conspiracy to foist a lad of unknown parentage on the throne but the conspirators lost heart at the last moment. This Khalil Shah is mentioned by none of the other historians. Then Razi ul Mulk who was the great grandson of Shakar Khan a younger son of Ahmad I was raised to the throne with the title of Ahmad Shah II.

¹ One MS. omits the prefix Miran.

² Firishtah calls him Āzam Khan Malvi.

³ Firishtah also says گلوله دوی but the Cambridge History of India page 344 says that Sayyid Mubarak was killed by an arrow.

about in distress for some days in the jungle, and then came and saw I'tmād Khān again. The latter confined him in his house, and did not permit anyone to approach him.

When I'tmād Khān's power increased, 'Imād-ul-mulk in concert with Tātār Khān Ghūrī attacked his house with ¹great force, and placing their cannon in position, commenced a bombardment. I'tmād Khān unable to meet them fled towards ²Pāl which is in the neighbourhood of Chāmpānī, and began to collect men from all sides. Then people intervened, and brought about a peace between him and 'Imād-ul-mulk. The districts of Bahīrj and Chāmpānī and Nādōt and the other *parganas* between the rivers Mahindī and Naibada were allotted to 'Imād-ul-mulk as his *jāgīr*, and I'tmād Khān came back, and again took charge of the duties of the *valīl* of the Sultān, and endeavoured to guard Sultān Ahmad as before, and they detached a body of fifteen hundred horsemen out of the personal *jāgīrs* of Sultān Ahmad. Other men joined the Sultān and in spite of the fact that I'tmād Khān prevented men from mixing with him, a number of men ³gathered round him, and for a short time he attained to some grandeur. He thought of getting rid of I'tmād Khān, and held a consultation with his confidants about slaying him. Sometimes, owing to his youthful inexperience he would strike his sword on a plantain tree and say "I have cut I'tmād Khān in two." When the latter became cognizant of these matters he forestalled the young Sultān, and one night put him to death and threw his corpse over the wall towards the river opposite to the house of Wajih-ul-mulk, and spread a report among men to the effect that the Sultān had gone to Wajih-ul-mulk's house at night to carry on an intrigue, and not being recognised, had been killed.

The period of his rule was eight years.

¹ The actual words are نصرب راست in some MSS, M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted نصرب راست in the text edition.

² Firishtah also has Pāl, but the Cambridge History of India, page 344, has Hālōl.

³ The MSS have بر دور او جمع شدند, and بر او جمع شدند and the lith ed has بر گرد او جمع شدند.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN MUZAFFAR SON OF SULTAN MAHMUD
SON OF ILMU KHAN

At the end of the year 967 A H 1562 A D Iltud Khan brought a boy by the name Nanū before the assembly of the *amirs* of Gujrat and swore that he was the ³son of Sultan Mahmud. He said that the boy's mother ⁴Jariah was an inmate of the special harem of the Sultan. When she became pregnant the Sultan made her over to me so that I may bring about her miscarriage. As her pregnancy had passed the fifth month I concealed her in my house and have looked after her up to this day. As the throne of Gujrat was vacant Sayid Miran the son of Sayid Mubarak Gujrati took up the imperial crown in the assembly of the great and the noble and ⁵placed it on the head

¹ This is the heading in the MS. In the lith ed the word نانو is inserted before the word Sultan.

² The name is نانو Nanu in one MS and in the lith ed and appears to be تانو Tanu in the other MS. Firishlah does not give the name. Col Briggs (vol IV p 15) calls him Hubboo which he says in a note is the familiar contraction of Hubeeb. The Tarikh-i-Gujarat (p 5) gives him the name of نانو Nahu but a few lines further on نانو Nathu. The Cambridge History of India page 34 calls him Nathu.

³ The Tarikh-i-Gujarat (p 5) tells a curious story about Nathu's father having been a گاوایل or cowherd and his mother having been taken prisoner by Sultan Mahmud that she was kept outside the harem of the Sultan and before the latter could see her and decide whether he would take her into the harem she gave birth to Nathu. As the child was born almost under the shadow of the Sultan's presence it resulted in his having the insignia of royalty for a time.

If this story is correct it is curious that the facts should not have been known to the *amirs* and Iltud Khan's stories should have received any credence.

⁴ I do not know what حارثه Jariah is or whether it is a proper name.

⁵ The word حاص occurs in one MS and in the lith ed but is omitted from the other MS.

⁶ Firishlah lith ed does not mention the coronation but says somewhat inconsistently that the *amirs* having no other alternative divided the kingdom among themselves and became completely independent. Col Briggs (vol IV p 155) says that the mother of the boy concealed her pregnancy till the fifth month when the medicines given to her to produce an abortion had no effect and the child was born and was brought up privately. Witnesses were

of that child. He received the title of Muzaffar Shāh, and the *amīrs* offered congratulations and felicitations on his accession.

The duties of the *vazīrs* continued to be entrusted to I'tmād Khān, and he received the title of *Masnad-i-Ālī*. The great *amīrs* having acquired independence in their *jāgīrs* did not allow anyone to interfere with them. Among them the district of Pattan as far as the *pargana* of ¹Kari came into the possession of Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān Fūlādī. In ²Rādhanpūr and Taiwāra and Tahiād and Maujpūr, and some other *parganas*, Fath Khān Balūch was in possession. ³The *parganas*, which were situated between the Sābar-matī and the Mahindī were in the possession of I'tmād Khān, who gave a portion of them to other Gujrātīs. The port of Sōiath and Nāgōt and Chāmpānīr were in the possession of Chengīz Khān son of 'Imād-ul-mulk Sultānī. Rustam Khān who was the husband of Chengīz Khān's sister held Bahiōj. Dūlqa and Dandūka were allotted to Saiyid Mirān son of Saiyid Mubāiak Bukhārī. Amīn Khān Ghūrī seized the fort of Junāgarh, and Sōiath, and ⁴kept himself aloof from the other *amīrs* of Gujrāt.

procured to swear to these facts and the evidence being considered sufficient, the boy was crowned. The version of the *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* has already been given. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, says that I'tmād Khān's history was totally false, but as an heir had to be found, the boy he produced was accepted.

¹ The name is *کری* in one MS and in the lith ed. It is omitted in the other. *Firishtah* lith ed has *کدلی*, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 156) has *Kuriy*. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has *Kādi*.

² *Firishtah* agrees as to the first two names. He does not mention the third, and calls the fourth *مورچپور* *Murchpūr*. Col Briggs calls them *Radunpoor*, *Neriad*, *Tehrware* and *Moonjpoor*. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, does not give the names, but says the whole of the north of Gujarāt as far south as *Kādi* was in the possession of Mūsā Khān and Sher Khān and Fath Khān. The *Tārīkh-i-Gujarāt* does not specify the *jāgīrs* of the different *amīrs*, but says they were all trying to extend their respective *jāgīrs* and encroaching on that of I'tmād Khān, and the latter sent petitions to Akbar to invade Gujarāt.

³ *Firishtah* and the Cambridge History of India, page 345, agree generally, but *Firishtah* and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 156) call Roostoom Khan the nephew (*حوامر راد*) of Chungīr Khan. The Cambridge History of India agrees with the *Tabaqāt* in calling him his brother-in-law.

⁴ One MS has *نعلی* instead of *نعلی*.

I tmad Khan kept Sultan Muzaffar Nanu ¹ more or less in a state of imprisonment in the palace of the Sultan. On the days of audience a *masnad* used to be spread for him and having seated him on it I tmad Khan himself ² sat behind him. The *amirs* attended to salute the Sultan. When some days had passed in this way Chengiz Khan and ³ Sher Khan Fuladi arrived at Ahmadabad to offer their condolences and congratulations to the Sultan. ⁴ When a year had passed in this way the Fuladis having found an opportunity attacked Fath Khan Baluch who had *parganas* Tahrād and Tarwara and Padhanpur and ⁵ Mūrwarā and Kahrej as his *jagir* and who on account of his proximity had hostility with them. He fought with them was defeated and went to I tmad Khan and complained to him. I tmad Khān was enraged at this and having collected troops attacked the Fuladis with a large and powerful force. The latter shut themselves up in the fort of Pattan and commenced to show their weakness and repentance. I tmad Khān did not accept their excuses and went on vigorously with the siege. When the Fuladi Afghans were reduced to great straits the young warriors among ⁶ them collected together and going to Musa Khan and Sher Khan said that as (I tmad Khān) does not accept our humility there is no other alternative but that we should fight with him and if necessary surrender our lives. Five hundred of them then sallied out of the fort and Musa Khan and Sher Khan with the men that they had—whose numbers did not amount to three thousand—also came out. I tmad Khan arrayed the Gujrati army which exceeded thirty thousand horsemen. The Fuladis

¹ The words are محبوس گویا

² در پس سر او lit behind his head

³ One MS omits the name of Sher Khan Fuladi apparently by mistake for the suffix Fuladi which belongs to Sher Khan is appended to the name of Chengiz Khan. Irishlah has both names

⁴ It is possible that something has been omitted here for it was hardly necessary to mention the arrival of Chengiz Khan and Sher Khan unless it was meant to lead to something

⁵ This may be the same as Maujpur already mentioned. In the text edition کاکریج has been adopted in place of کاکریج

⁶ One MS and the lith ed and the lith ed of Firishlah have ان جماعه but the other MS has اس طامعه

hurled themselves on I'tmād Khān's special troops and drove them away. Hajī Khān, a slave of Salīm Khān the son of Shēr Khān, who was one of the leaders of I'tmād Khān's army stood aside without joining in the battle. I'tmād Khān was defeated and went back to Ahmadābād. He endeavoured to seize Hajī Khān. The latter, becoming aware of it, fled and joined the Fūlādīs. They then sent a message to I'tmād Khān to the following effect: "As a half of *paigana* Kāi was the *jāgīr* of Hajī Khān, and he has come and joined us, you should relinquish possession of it." I'tmād Khān did not agree to this, and replied, "He was my servant. Although he has fled and gone away, why should I give up his *jāgīr*?" Mūsā Khān and Shēr Khān then collected a force and came to the *jāgīr* of Hajī Khān, and posted themselves in the town of ¹Jūthānah. I'tmād Khān again collected a force and came and met them. They stood opposing one another for a period of four months, and at last engaged in battle. I'tmād Khān was defeated, and went to Chengīz Khān at Bahiōj and brought him to help and reinforce himself. The parties again met in the neighbourhood of Jūthānah. After a great deal of talk, there was an amicable settlement. I'tmād Khān gave up possession of Hajī Khān's *jāgīr*, and went back and took up his quarters at Ahmadābād.

Chengīz Khān went back to his own country, and began to aspire to independence. It became bruited about among men, that he had no wish to continue to be in allegiance, and no intention to act as a subject. He sent a message to I'tmād Khān to the following effect: "I am a *khānazād* or slave of this threshold (i.e., of the Sultāns of Gujrāt), and have knowledge of every incident that takes place in the harem. It was known as a matter of certainty till today, that the martyred Sultān Mahmūd Shāh had no son, and in spite of that you have produced a boy before the people, describing him as the son of Sultān Mahmūd. And what is the meaning of this that he himself sits in the *maylis*, and his men guard that boy? And as long as he does not come no one can go to offer homage. If in fact the boy

¹ The name is written as *چونہاد* in the MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishta. It is *حونہاد* in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt. The Cambridge History of India, page 345, has Jotāna.

is the son of Sultān Mahmud then he (Imad Khan) should like all the other *amirs* and the special tribesmen render homage and when the other *amirs* sit down in the *majlis* he should also sit down after obtaining permission. Imad Khan wrote in reply. I solemnly swore on the day of the accession in the presence of the great men of the city and the *amirs* that this boy was the son of Sultān Mahmud and they relying on my words placed the imperial crown on his head and rendered homage to him. And as to what you have said about my sitting in the *majlis* it is known to everyone what my rank and condition in the service of Sultān Mahmud was. You were only a boy at that time. If your father Imad ul mulk Sultān had been alive he would have testified to the truth of what I am saying. This lord and master of ours the son of our martyr lord and master by whose accession the imperial throne has now acquired a new beauty and glory is your sovereign and the son of your sovereign. Your well being consists in this that you do not turn your head from service and allegiance to serve him so that you may gather the fruit of your desire from the tree of hope.

And Shēr Khan Iuladī having become aware of this correspondence wrote a letter to Chengiz Khan to the following effect. You should for a few days draw your feet beneath the skirt of patience and should not abandon the path of gentleness and should not unnecessarily begin a show of hostility towards Masnadī Āli (Imad Khan).² After some days Chengiz Khan having struck the teeth of greed into the town of Baroda sent the following message. Many men have collected round me and this contemptible country which is in my possession is not sufficient for them. As the reins of all affairs and the loosening and tying of all matters are entrusted to the wisdom and insight of Masnadī Āli he should think about it. Imad Khan wanted to entangle him in a dispute with the rulers of Burhanpur so that being engaged with them he might not make any attempt

¹ The MSS and the lith. ed. have *در حد مرید*. I think the correct reading should be *در حد مرید* and I have adopted it.

² Firishtah copies the *Tabaqat* almost word for word but with reference to Chengiz Khan's demand for additional territory he says in so many words what indeed is implied in the *Tabaqat* that he did not agree to Shēr Khan's suggestion.

against these parts. He accordingly sent the following reply, "The town of Nadarbāi was always in the possession of the *amīr* of Gujrāt. At the time when the martyr Sultān Mahmūd Shāh was in the fort of Sāwal, in the company of Mirān Mubārak Shāh, he made a promise to the latter that if the great and holy God should ever place the reins of the government of the country of Gujrāt in his grasp of power, he would make Nadarbāi over to him as a reward. After that the martyr Sultān sat on the throne of the empire, and in order to fulfil his promise, which is the absolute duty of and is entirely incumbent on all great men, he gave the town of Nadarbār to Mirān Mubārak Shāh. Now that the Sultān has attained the rank of a martyr and Mirān Mubārak Shāh has also departed (from the world), it is advisable that you should march with your troops to the town of Nadarbāi, and should with great quickness, in order to increase your revenue take possession of it, till in the course of time some better plan can be devised."

Chengīz Khān was duped, and commenced to collect troops. After a few days, he advanced to Bahīōj with a well-equipped army ready for action, and marching by successive stages, took possession of Nadarbāi. Owing to his vanity, conceit and pride he advanced still further, till he reached the neighbourhood of the fort of ¹ Tālnūr. It so happened that at this time news came that ² Mirān Muhammad Shāh son of Mirān Mubārak Shāh was coming to give him battle, in concert with Tufāl Khān and the Rāja of Māhūr. Chengīz Khān posted his army in a place which was broken and cut up by ravines, and on the side on which the ground was even, he strengthened his position by a line of carts fastened by chains. Muhammad Shāh and Tufāl Khān arrayed their troops in a line in front of Chengīz Khān's army and waited till sunset. As Chengīz Khān did not come

¹ The lith. ed. of *Firishtah* has by mistake Thānēsai, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 159) has Talnere, and the *Cambridge History of India*, page 346, has Thālner.

² *Firishtah* and the *Cambridge History of India* agree, but the former calls Mirān Muhammad Shāh Muhammad Mirān Shāh, and the latter rather inadequately describes him as Muhammad II. Tufāl Khān is called ruler of Berār by *Firishtah*, and is described as of Berar in the *Cambridge History of India* (p. 346). The Rāja of Māhūr is not mentioned by either.

out they encamped where they were Chengiz Khan ¹ owing to the bad luck due to his pride and malice was so overwhelmed with fear and alarm that leaving all his troops and followers behind he fled to Bahroj Muhammad Shah seized much booty and pursued Chengiz Khan as far as Nadarbar and again took possession of that *pargana*

When Chengiz Khan arrived in the fort of Bahroj after his defeat he began to repair the damage which his army had sustained and having acquired new strength and vigour from ² the coming of Ibrahim Husain Mirza and Shah Mirza descendants of Muhammad Sultan Mirza his own determination to punish I tmad Khan was revived ³ in his mind In order to carry out this design he collected troops and advanced towards Ahmadabad He occupied the town of Baroda without any fighting When he arrived at Mahmudabad he sent the following message to I tmad Khan namely that It is patent and evident to the world and to all its inhabitants that my defeat at Talnir was really due to your malice for if ⁴ you had either come yourself to reinforce me or had sent a body of troops the dust of flight would not at all have settled on the skirts of my honour Now I am coming to Ahmadabad in order to offer my congratulations and felicitations to the Sultan in person and I know that if you are present in the city some dispute or hostility is sure to occur It is therefore desirable that you should go out of the city and like all the other *amirs* take up your abode in your *jagir* and make the arms of the Sultan strong in the government so that he may exercise every act of dominion in his ancestral territory in any way that he may like

¹ Firishtah copies this almost literally except that he says that Chengiz Khan fled *باسم حرد* The Cambridge History of India (p 346) says that he was attacked defeated and fled instead of fleeing ignominiously without being attacked at all

² Firishtah explains that the Mirzas fled from Sambal and came to Malwa and when Akbar's army advanced against them in 975 A H they having no other alternative came and joined Chengiz Khan

³ Both MSS have *ار حاطرس* but the lith ed has *در حاطرس*

⁴ One MS inserts *و* between *اگر* and *نکومک* but the other MS and the lith ed do not

I'tmād Khān had commenced to equip his army even before the arrival of this message, and when it came, he knew what Chengīz Khān's real object was. He raised the royal umbrella over the head of Muzaffar, and in concert with the Sayyids of Bukhāra and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Malik Sharq and Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and Saif-ul-mulk left the city and encamped in the neighbourhood of the town of Batūh. The next day they marched from there and halted at *mauda'* ¹ Kāvī, which is situated on the bank of the Khāī nadī and is six *lāṭōhs* from Ahmadābād. On the morning of the next day Chengīz Khān arrayed his troops, and came out of Mahmūdābād, and advanced towards the battlefield. When he arrived at *mauda'* Kāvī, at the time of the morning meal, I'tmād Khān placed Sultān Muzaffar on a horse and placing the royal umbrella over his head, advanced towards the battlefield, and the Sayyids and the Gujratī *amīrs* and the Habshī group took up their positions. When the two armies faced each other, and the frightened eyes of I'tmād Khān fell on Chengīz Khān's army, as he had ² formerly repeatedly heard of the courage and prowess of the Mīrzās, he imagined each one of those ³ brave men and bold warriors to be the captor of his sword, and took the way of flight before even a sword was drawn out of its scabbard, and fled towards Dūngarpūr without even going to Ahmadābād. The other *amīrs* also fled, after heaping a hundred ⁴ plaudits on I'tmād Khān. The Sayyids went to Dūlqa, and Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk to Mahmūdabad. Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and the others went towards Ahmadābād, taking Muzaffar with them.

Chengīz Khān was pleased and delighted at gaining this victory, which was one of the favours of God, and halted at Batūh. Early on the following morning, Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān and the other *Habshīs* left Ahmadābād by the Kālūpūr gate, taking Sultān Muzaffar with them, and went towards Bīrpūr and Ma'mūrābād. When

¹ M. Hidayat Hosain also has کوری as the name of the *mauda'* in the text edition.

² One MS. has سابق while the other and the lith. ed. have سابقاً

³ One MS. has دلاواران instead of دلبران

⁴ The MSS. as well as the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have آمیزیں. One would have thought that نفیریں would be the right word.

Muzaffar was leaving Ahmadabād Chengiz Khan entered the place and took up his abode at the mansion of Iʿtimād Khan Sher Khan Puladī on hearing this news in the neighbourhood in the town of Kari sent a message to Chengiz Khan to the effect that all this country had been in the possession of Iʿtimād Khan to defray the expense of the Sultan and now that he alone had come to be in possession of it it ¹ was contrary to the custom of generosity and the rules of kindness and he advanced with a large army towards Ahmadabād Chengiz Khan saw that it was not expedient that he should at such a time be engaged in a dispute with Sher Khan He therefore settled with the latter that whatever should be situated on the other side of the river Sīrmatī should belong to him Owing to this some portions of Ahmadabad such as Usmanpur Khanpur and Kalupur fell into Sher Khan's share Chengiz Khan held the Mirzas in great honour and regard owing to the excellent services which they have rendered him

As Miran Muhammad Shah son of Miran Mubārak Shah had been emboldened by his first victory and found the kingdom of Gujrat without a head he considering the disputes and hostility among the *amirs* to be a very great mercy advanced with the object of conquering the country and did not draw his reins till he came opposite to Ahmadabad Chengiz Khan in concert with the Mirzas came out of the city with the object of giving battle The Miran was defeated in the battle which took place and fled and went back to Asir in great confusion losing everything that he had with him

As this victory was gained by the great exertions of the Mirzas Chengiz Khan in order to please them allotted some fertile and well

¹ The sentence is rather clumsily worded although its purport is clear enough Sher Khan did not think it right that Chengiz Khan should get hold of the whole of the territory and he should have no part of it but it is not quite clear what was remote from *أبى مروت و رسم مروت* Probably he wanted to appeal to Chengiz Khan's better nature but in that case one would expect that he would wait for the result of that appeal instead of marching at once at the head of a large army

² One MS has Iʿtimādpur but the other MS and the lith ed and the lith ed of Firishtah have Usmanpur The first MS and the lith ed have Kalupur after Khanpur but the other MS and the lith ed of Firishtah omit Khanpur

populated *paraganas* in *sarlān* Bahurōj as their *jāgīrs*, and gave them permission to go there, so that they might entertain retainers and equip them. When they arrived in the estates appertaining to their *jāgīrs* and low class people, and the people who were always in search of adventure collected round them, and as the revenues of their *jāgīrs* did not suffice for their entertainment they found it necessary to occupy other estates without the permission of Chengīz Khān. ¹ When this news reached the latter, he sent an army to attack them. They defeated that army and slew a number of the men and advanced towards the territory of Burhānpūr, and after interfering in the affairs of that country they went to Mālwa. The details of the affairs of the Mirzās have already been narrated in the history of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhi.

In short when Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān went to the country of ² Kānthā, which is the name given to the broken country along the bank of the river Mahendī, taking Muzaffar with them, and waited for a long time in the expectation, that perhaps Itmād Khān would come himself, or send his son Shēr Khān to take Muzaffar away, but as there was no hint of any kind from him, they themselves took Sultān Muzaffar to Dūngarpūr, and made him over to Itmād Khān. After some days they asked for some money from him to defray the expenses of their soldiers. Itmād Khān told them in reply that the yield or revenue of his *jāgīr*, such as it was, known to all, and also the amount of his expenditure, and besides the place where they were was not

¹ Firishtah goes into greater detail about the force sent by Chengīz Khān against the Mirzās, and about the proceeding of the latter, after their victory, and also gives a reason for their retiring to Burhānpūr. According to him Chengīz Khān's army consisted of three or four thousand Habshīs, and five or six thousand Gujrātīs. The Mirzās after defeating the army put a number of them to death, and pursuing the others captured a number of men both Habshīs and Gujrātīs. The young and beardless among them they kept as personal attendants, and released the others who had beards, after treating them with great barbarity, putting arrows through their noses, and binding their arms behind them, and placing circular pieces of wood round their necks. As they did all this, and knew that Chengīz Khān would come in person to attack them, they went away towards Burhānpūr.

² The name is Kānthā in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and Kānhā in the other MS. It is Kānth in the lith. ed. of Firishtah.

a city that he should be able to pay them after taking a loan from someone. Owing to this ¹ Ulugh Khan and the other *amirs* were annoyed with I timad Khan.

Chengiz Khan ² becoming aware of this sent conciliatory letters to each one of them and asked them to come to him. Ulugh Khan and Jhuhjar Khan and Saif ul mulk and other *Habshis* advanced towards Māmurābād without obtaining leave from I timad Khan and having met Ikhtiyar ul mulk Gujrati there they all went forward towards Ahmadābād. When they arrived at the Kakria tal or reservoir which is close to the city they halted at the garden of Sultān Mahmud to change their dresses. At that time Chengiz Khan came there in haste to welcome them and met Ikhtiyar ul mulk. Ulugh Khan, Jhuhjar Khan and other *Habshis* there. After they had finished making courteous enquiries about one another Ulugh Khan and Jhuhjar Khan said: It is clear to the world and to all men that we are all slaves born and bred in the house of Sultān Mahmud. If one of us has been favoured by fortune more than the other yet as regards that primary fact there is no difference amongst us and it is right that it should be borne in mind and observed in all our interviews. The reason for this remark is that among the Sultān's slaves some have been distinguished by advancement in the service and they are now present in this assembly. Hereafter whenever any of us has to salute or see any other it is to be hoped that he will not be prevented by chamberlains and ushers. Chengiz Khan with great show of politeness accepted this statement and taking the other *amirs* with him went to the city and having caused some houses to be vacated placed them at their disposal.

After some time one day a spy came to Ulugh Khan and informed him that Chengiz Khan wanted to put him and Jhuhjar Khan to death.

¹ Firishtah agrees but the Cambridge History of India page 346 says that Ulugh Khan whom it calls (Muhammad) Ulugh Khan and (Marjan) Jhuhjar Khan awaited help from I timad Khan or from Sher Khan Ful di but being disappointed joined Ikhtiyar ul Mull and marched with him to Ahmadabad thus omitting all mention of their visit to Dungarpur and their making over of the Sultan to I timad Khan there.

² Both MSS have **وہی حاصل کردہ** but the lith ed and the lith ed of Firishtah have **وہی ناسخہ**.

the Bahdar *chaugan* field After they had gone a part of the way Ulugh Khan who was to the right of Chengiz Khan made a sign to Jhuhjar Khan who was on his left side that it was an opportunity that should not be lost Jhuhjar Khan immediately struck Chengiz Khan with his sword in such a way¹ that it appeared as if his head had not at all been accompanying him They then all galloped back to their houses and prepared to fight Ikhtiyar ul mulk also joined with them and made ready Rustam Khan threw the body of Chengiz Khan on the back of an elephant and started towards Bahroj instead of taking it to his house in the city The mob of the city then stretched their hands to plunder Chengiz Khan's followers

When it was known for certain that Rustam Khan had gone away towards Bahroj Ulugh Khan and Ikhtiyar ul mulk and Jhuhjar Khan and the other leaders went to the citadel which was known by the name Bahdar They wrote a letter to Itmad Khan and informed him of what had happened and invited him to Ahmadabad On the same day Badr Khan and Muhammad Khan sons of Sher Khan Fuladi came into the city in order to offer their congratulations and brought presents of horses for every one (of the *amirs*) They (') confirmed anew the distribution of the *jagirs* among the *amirs* as Chengiz Khan had settled it

The next day Sher Khan Fuladi sent his spies and ascertained that none of the retainers of the *amirs* remained in the fort in Bahdar

request that it would be better if he came quickly Chengiz Khan had apparently been drinking but he came out mounted after putting on some light clothing

¹ The words *که سرس با نكدسب گونا باد همراة ندود* are somewhat fanciful and difficult to understand M. Hidavat Hosain has introduced *گونا* between *سرس* and *همراة* Firishtah's language *سرس نكدسب ارس جدا سد* is clear As regards the complaint of Chengiz Khan's mother to Albar about Jhuhjar Khan having killed her son and Akbar's punishment of Jhuhjar Khan by ordering him to be trampled under the feet of an elephant see page 389 of vol II of the translation Jhuhjar Khan apparently did not plead right of self defence as he might well have done

According to Firishtah he was a nephew sister's son of Chengiz Khan who was following the latter with his troops The Cambridge History of India page 347 call him Chengiz Khan's brother in law

² Somewhat contrary to this the Cambridge History of India page 34 says that Ulugh Khan and his partisans took possession of the citadel

to guard it Acting on this information on the 3rd night after the murder of Chengīz Khān, he sent Sādāt Khān, who had been one of the nobles of Shēr Khān, with three hundred men They broke down the walls of the fort in the direction of Khānpur, and took possession of Bahdar After some days I'tmād Khān arrived at Ahmadābād, bringing Muzaffar with him As the fort of Bahdar was in the possession of Sādāt Khān, he took Muzaffar to his own house, but he wrote a letter to Shēr Khān on the subject of the evacuation of Bahdar He told him that Bahdar had always been the residence of the Sultāns Even if the Sultān did not happen to be in Ahmadābād, it was the duty of his servants and well-wishers, that they should guard the palace of their master, and should not occupy it themselves, or take possession of it Now that the Sultān had come to the city, he should direct Sādāt Khān to vacate it Shēr Khān acted according to his request, either because it was the only right thing to do, or because he was under certain obligations to I'tmād Khān, and vacated Bahdar Sultān Muzaffar then went and took up his abode in his own palace

While these things were happening, scouts brought the news, that the Mirzās had fled from Mālwa and were coming to Gujrāt, and that when they heard, while they were still on the way, that Chengīz Khān had been murdered, they became pleased and delighted, and turned towards Bahrōj and Sōrath, so that they might seize that *sūba* also Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk and Ulugh Khān went to the palace, and said that Bahrōj was at present without any master, and people were saying that the Mirzās were advancing in that direction It was right that all the *amīns* should collect their forces and march to Bahrōj, and take possession of that territory, and ¹ in the carrying out of this intention should not give way to any hesitation or delay, for if Bahrōj went once into the possession of the Mirzās, they would all have to pour out much of their heart's blood, before they would be able to recover it from them

¹ The MSS appeared to be imperfect here One has بعث بمودة عارم و تاحير بحود راه دهند - بعث بمودة عارم بهروج The other is better, it has بعث بمودة عارم بهروج و تاحير بحود راه دهند - بعث بمودة عارم بهروج و تاحير بحود راه دهند - و اسکا را تصرف آوردند - و در ابعاد این دیات تعویق و تاحیر بحود راه دهند - The lith ed appears to have the best reading, it agrees with the second MS, but has ابقاء instead of ابعاد, and تعویق instead of تاحیر I have adopted this reading, but ابعاد has been retained in the text edition

Itmad Khan sent a messenger to Sher Khan and asked his opinion. Sher Khan also agreed to undertake the expedition. It was then agreed that the entire army should be divided into three detachments. The first detachment headed by Ulugh Khan and the other *Habshis* should go one stage in advance. When they would advance beyond their first station Itmad Khan and Ikhṭiyār ul mulk and the other *amirs* who would command the second detachment should encamp there. When the second detachment should advance from that station the third detachment which would be commanded by Sher Khan Fuladī and other *amirs* should take up its position there. Sadat Bukhārī should remain in the position where he was. When according to this agreement Ulugh Khan and Juhjar Khan and Saif ul mulk and the other *Habshis* arrived at Mahmūdabad Itmad Khan¹ did not go out of the city and cancelled the previous agreement.

Ulugh Khan and his friends suspecting treachery on his part from this conduct said to each other: We slew a (powerful) enemy of his like Chengiz Khan and he is now acting traitorously towards us. It is advisable that we should take possession of this territory (sief) and divide it among ourselves. They confirmed this determination and took possession of *pargana* Kanbūyet and Patlad and some other *parganas*. Men who had no *jagirs* came from the city and joined the service of Ulugh Khan. The latter said to Juhjar Khan: Soldiers

¹ There are variations in the readings and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS has اعتمد خان بنون نروب و فتح آن عرب نمود the other has اعتمد خان ار سهر بنون نروب و فتح آن عرب نمود the lith ed agrees with the latter reading but substitutes فتح for فتح. It is needless to say that both فتح and فتح are utterly incorrect and the correct word is فتح. Firsihtah lith ed has it. His version is different and I am quoting it as it gives some reason for Itmad Khan's conduct. He says اعتمد خان مدوهم سد و ار سهر بنون فتح فتح آن عرب نمود which means Itmad Khan became suspicious and going out of the city cancelled the previous agreement. Col Briggs's (vol IV p 164) version is that Itmad Khan with his accustomed cowardice threw obstacles in the progress of the second corps which he commanded and refused to move. The Cambridge History of India page 347 also says Itmad Khan refused to leave the capital.

have come to me from the capital, it is ¹ advisable that one of the *paṛḡanas* of I'tmād Khān should be allotted for the payment of their wages" Jhuhjār Khān replied, "Give all the land that you wish to give to these men to me, and whatever you expect from them, you will get from me" In the end there was contention and hostility between them, on the score of the division of this territory

I'tmād Khān receiving information of this ² deceived Jhuhjār Khān by his artifice and trickery, and summoned him to join him As he went to I'tmād Khān, there was great infirmity and weakness in the grandeur of the *Habshī* party Ulugh Khān then went to Shēr Khān Fūlādī, and Sādāt Bukhārī also joined the latter As Shēr Khān's side became stronger, Sultān Muzaffar also, availing himself of an opportunity, came out one day through a window and with a few of his immediate attendants went to Ulugh Khān at Ghīyāspūr, which is near the town of Sarkhēj Ulugh Khān went to wait on Shēr Khān, without seeing him He told Shēr Khān, "Sultān Muzaffar has, without giving me previous intimation, come to my house, but I have not yet seen him" Shēr Khān said, "As a beloved guest has come, you should go and carry out the rites of service"

Early the next morning, a letter came from I'tmād Khān to Shēr Khān, to the following effect "As Nanū was not the son of the Sultān, ³ I have repudiated him And I have summoned the Mirzās, so that I may make over the capital of Gujrāt to them" After reading

¹ There are some differences in the readings The word *که یکی* before *ار پرگنا* is omitted in one MS, but occurs in the other and in the lith ed, and the same word before *مود* occurs in both MSS, but not in the lith ed I have inserted it

² Both the MSS have *فریخته* and I have adopted it, though *فریخته* which is in the lith ed and in the corresponding passage in the lith ed of *Firishtah* is just as good

³ The reading in the MSS, as well as in the lith ed is *اورا برآوردم* This may have the meaning I have given it in the text, or it may mean, when I brought him forward The context shows that the first is the correct meaning *Firishtah* lith ed is more explicit It is *که چون ماهر فرورد شاه مود سا* *لهذا او را بیرون موده میروزیانرا* *اللیدهام* *ذالت مود*, i.e., as Muzaffar was not the son of Shāh Mahmūd Shāh III, I have driven him out, and have summoned the Mirzās

this letter Sher Khan went to the house of Saʿyid Hamid ¹ Bukhari and enquired of him as to what had been ascertained at the time of the accession. Saʿyid Hamid and the other Saʿyids said: Iʿtmad Khan swore on the *Quran* that the boy was a son of Sulṭān Mahmūd and he has now written these words on account of his enmity. Sher Khan rode back from the house of Saʿyid Hamid to that of Ulugh Khan and with his bow in his hands rendered homage to Sulṭān Muzaḥḥar in the way in which a servant does homage to his master and mounting him on a horse brought him to his own house in order to render homage to him there.

Iʿtmad Khan summoned the Mirzas from the country of Bihroḥ. He sent detachments from their followers and those of Iḥṭiyār ul mulk every day to fight. Gradually the contention and hostility was much prolonged and as Iʿtmad Khan saw that nothing was affected he sent a petition to His Majesty the Khalifa ʿIlāhī and begged him to come and conquer the country of Gujrat. As it happened at that time which was the year 988 (1572 A.D.) His Majesty had come to Nagōr and had sent Mir Muhammad Āṭha who was celebrated as Khan Kalan with a large army of renowned *amirs* to conquer Sirohi. As ² the Khan Kalan was wounded by the ambassador of the Raja of Sirohi the emperor himself with good fortune and prosperity advanced towards the Khan Kalan's army and (from there) without any delay marched towards Gujrat. The particulars of this brief statement have been narrated in the history of the events of the reign of His Majesty the Khalifa ʿIlāhī.

In short when the world conquering standards arrived at Pattan Gujrat Sher Khan who was at this time besieging Ahmadabad lost the use of his hands and feet (i.e. became utterly bewildered) and fled and Ibrahim Husain Mirza and his brothers went towards Baroda and Bahroḥ. Iʿtmad Khan and ⁴ Mir Abū Turab and Ulugh Khan

¹ M. H. Dayat Hosam has سعد حامد in the text edition instead of Saʿyid Hamid Bukhari as in the translation above.

Firishtah adds and the Habshis.

² He was actually wounded by one of the followers of the mission. See page 371 of vol. II of the translation.

⁴ Firishtah itself calls him Mirza Abu Turab Shirazi. He is the author of the *Tārīkh-i Gujarat* which has been edited by Sir Denison Ross. His full

Habshī and Jhuhjār *Khān* and *Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk*, having determined on serving at the threshold, which was the abode of the angels, became enlisted in the band of the loyal servants. The kingdom of Gujrāt¹ ended here, and became a part of the imperial dominions of His Majesty the *Khalīfa-i-Īlāhī*. Other incidents connected with Sultān Muzaffar *Khān* and the Gujrātīs have been narrated in the auspicious history of His Majesty the *Khalīfa-i-Īlāhī*.

The period of the rule of Sultān Muzaffar extended to thirteen years and some months.

SECTION VI ²THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF BANGĀLA

It will not remain concealed from the minds of men of understanding, that the beginning of the appearance of Islām in the country of Bangāla was from (the time of) ³ Muhammad Bakhtiyār who had been one of the great *amīrs* of ⁴ Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn Aibak. After him the *amīrs* of the Sultāns of Dehlī ruled one after another. Their histories have been narrated in the course of the history of the ⁵ Sultāns of Dehlī. When Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn who was the *silāhdār*, trooper or armour-bearer, of Qadr *Khān*, the ruler of Bangāla as Viceroy of

name appears to be Mir Abu Tirāb Wālī who belonged to the Salāmī Sayyids of Shirāz.

¹ The correct date is given as the 14th Rajab, 980 A H, in the lith ed of Firishtah. The corresponding date according to Col Briggs (vol IV, p 165) is November 20th 1572. The same date is also given in the Cambridge History of India, page 348.

² This section which follows that about Mālwa in the MSS is printed between those about Gujrāt and Sharqia in the lith ed. M Hidayat Hosain has followed the sequence in the lith ed for the text, and the same has been adopted for the translation.

The heading in the MSS is as I have it in the text. In the lith ed it is
ہندوستان کے حکومت سلطانی

³ One MS has Mahmūd instead of Muhammad.

⁴ The same MS has by mistake بیگ سلطان Qutb Bēg.

⁵ Both MSS have سلطانین طہقہ دہلی. This is incorrect. If the word طہقہ is at all inserted, it should be before سلطانین.

¹ Muhammad Tughluq Shah slew him he gave himself the name of Sultān After him the kingdom of Bangāla became separated from the empire of Dehli and the hand of the dominion of the Sultans of Dehli did not reach the kings (of Bangāla) and they appropriated ³ the name of Sultān for themselves

The beginning of the section about Bangāla has been made from Malik Fakhr ud din ⁴ (The names of the various Sultāns are) —

¹ One MS has محمود Mahmud

² One MS has by mistake امير but the other and the lith ed have

³ One MS has اسم the other has مراسم while the lith ed has مراسم اسم

⁴ For the list of the kings of Bengal as given in the Cambridge History of India see vol III page 690 According to it there were two kings in east Bengal with their capital at Sonargaon in the Meghna in the present district of Dacca namely Fakhr ud din Mubarak Shah 1339 A H 1338 A D to 700 A H 1349 A D and Ikhtiyar ud din Ghazi Shah 700 A H 1349 A D to 753 A H 1350 A D after which the kingdom was conquered by Haji Sham ud din Ilyas Bhangara and incorporated with western Bengal The kings of western Bengal begin with No 7 of the lists given in the Tabaqat As regards the names and period Firishtah agrees about No 1 but about No 2 he has one year and five months As regards No 3 there is great divergence One MS and the lith ed have ten years the other MS has two years Firishtah has nine years and some months Col Briggs (vol IV p 33) has ten years and the Cambridge History of India page 66 also gives him ten years from 1390 A H when he is said to have peaceably succeeded his father to 1406 A H when he died In the list of the kings of Bengal on page 69 however he is only given two years from 1410 to 1412 A H No 4 is said to have reigned for three years according to a MS and the lith ed and Firishtah and Col Briggs (vol IV p 336) The Cambridge History of India page 66 says he was allowed to ascend the throne but was a mere puppet and exercised no power he died after a reign of little more than three years His name is not however given in the lists on page 695 though another puppet Shihab ud din Bayad who succeeded him has his name in that list No 8 is called Raja Kans in one MS and Raja Kansī in the other The lith eds both of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah have Raja Kan Col Briggs (vol IV p 336) has Raja Kans Poorby The Cambridge History of India page 66 calls him Raja Ganesh of Dinajpur but says that he is called Raja Kans by most Muslim historians in the list on page 695 he is called Ganesh of Bhaduria (Kans Narayan) About No 9 there is no difference in the MSS and in the lith ed except that one MS calls the father Kansī and not Kan Firishtah lith ed calls him Jivmal the son of Kans who had the title of Sultān Jalal ud din and says that he ruled for seventeen years and some

months. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 337) calls him Jectmul entitled Julal ood deen and says he reigned for seventeen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 266, calls him Jatmall, who was raised to the throne under the title of Jalāl ud dīn Muhammad and says he ruled for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is, however, called Jadu *alias* Jalāl ud dīn Muhammad Shāh. About No 10 there is no difference in the MS and the lith ed. In the lith ed of Firishtah the word Sultān is prefixed to the name of the father and the period of his reign is said to have been sixteen years. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 338) calls him Ahmud Poorby and says he reigned for eighteen years. The Cambridge History of India, page 267 and also page 695, calls him Shams ud dīn Ahmad Shāh, and says he reigned for eleven years only from 1431 to 1442 A D.

About No 11 there is no difference in the MS, but the lith ed omits the word *bin*, son of, before Ahmad. Firishtah lith ed says Nāsir-ud dīn, a slave, who usurped the throne, reigned for seven days and according to another account for half a day. Col Briggs agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 267, calls him Nāsir Khān, originally a slave, and later one of the principal officers of the State, who assumed the title of Nāsir ud dīn Mahmūd and is said on page 267 to have reigned peacefully for seventeen years. In the list on page 695, he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. About No 12 there is no difference between the MSS and the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed calls him Sultān Nāsir-ud dīn Shāh Bhangara and says he ruled for thirty two years. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 339) calls him Nasir Poorby, and says he reigned for two years. In the Cambridge History of India the Nāsir-ud dīn and the Nāsir Shāh of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah are, apparently, made into one man. He is said on page 268 to have died in 1459, though in the list on page 695 he is said to have reigned from 1442 to 1460. As regards No 13, one MS calls him Bīn Bārbak Shāh, but otherwise the MSS and the lith ed agree. Firishtah lith ed and Col Briggs (who, however, calls him Barbik Poorby) agree. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Rukn ud dīn Bārbak and says he succeeded his father in 1459 and died in 1474, and thus reigned for about fifteen years. On page 695 he is called Rukn-ud dīn Bārbak Shāh and is said to have reigned from 1460 to 1474, or for about fourteen years. About No 14 the MSS and the lith ed agree, but the lith ed of Firishtah gives him seven years and six months, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 339) gives him between seven and eight years. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, calls him Shams ud dīn Yūsuf, who reigned for seven years from 1474 to 1481. There is much difference in the periods of No 15's reign, one MS and the lith ed have half a day, while the other MS has two half years and two half days. The meaning of which is difficult to find out. Firishtah lith ed gives him two months. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 340) says he was deposed on the day he was raised to the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 268, also says that he was immediately deposed, as his intellect was deranged.

The name of No 16 is omitted from one MS. I have given in the text what is written about him in the other MS. The lith ed calls him Fath, without any

prefix or suffix and gives him seven years and five months. Firishtah lith ed agrees with the lith ed of *Tabaqat* in giving him a reign of seven years and five months. Col Briggs (vol IV p 340) calls him Futteh Poorby and says he was murdered after a reign of seven years. The Cambridge History of India page 68 says he reigned from 1481 to 1486 (i.e. for five years) when he was assassinated. As to No 17 both the MSS and the lith ed have the reading I have in the text. Firishtah lith ed says Barbak Shah reigned according to one statement for eight months and according to another for two and a half months. Col Briggs (vol IV p 341) calls him the Eunuch Shahzada and says he reigned for two months. The Cambridge History of India calls him Barbak the Eunuch Sultan Shahzada in the list on page 69 and gives a rather long account of how he was killed on page 269 but does not mention the exact period of his reign. The MSS and the lith ed agree as to No 18 and say what I have translated in the text. Firishtah calls him Malik Indil Habshu who had the title of Firuz Shah and says he ruled for three years. Col Briggs (vol IV p 344) calls him Mullik Andee Feroze Poorby and says he ruled for thirteen years apparently from 886 A.H. to 899 A.H. The corresponding A.D. period 1401 to 1493 is apparently incorrect. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the year of his accession on page 69 but says he reigned for two years and died in 1489. In the list of the kings on pp 695 696 the years of his accession and death are 1486 and 1489 respectively.

As to No 19 the MSS and the lith ed agree but there are slight mistakes. Firishtah lith ed calls him Shah Mahmud Shah and says he ruled for one year but it also mentions a statement in the History of Hajj Muhammad Qandahari according to which he ruled merely in name under the guardianship of Habib Khan a slave of Shah Barbak Shah at the end of which Habib Khan wanted to rule himself but he was slain by Sidi Badr Diwana who also slew the infant king and proclaimed himself as Sultan Muzaffar Shah. Col Briggs and the Cambridge History of India agree generally. The MSS and the lith ed agree in saying what I have in the text in respect of No 20. Firishtah calls him Sidi Badr Habsi who had the title of Muzaffar Shah and says he reigned for three years and five months. Col Briggs (vol IV p 348) says he reigned for three years. The Cambridge History of India page 270 also says he reigned for three years and in the list of king he is said to have reigned from 1430 to 1493 A.D. The MSS and the lith ed also agree about No 21. Firishtah lith ed calls him Sharif Makhī celebrated as Sultan Alauddin and says he reigned for twenty seven years. Col Briggs (vol IV p 348) agrees as to the period of his reign but calls him Alaooddeen Poorby II. The Cambridge History of India page 696 calls him Sayid Ala ud din Sharif Makhī and says he reigned from 1493 to 1518 i.e. for twenty five years. His full title as can be gathered from his coins is given on page 270 and the period of his reign is mentioned there also as twenty five years. Neither of the MSS gives the period of Nasib Shah's reign. The lith ed calls him Nasir Shah and gives him eleven days. Firishtah lith ed calls him Shah Nasir Shah and says he ascended the throne in 97 and died in 943 which would give him about sixteen years. Col Briggs

Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn, ¹ two years and some months,
 Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn, one year and some months,
 Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, sixteen years and some months,
 Sultān Sikandar, son of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, nine years and some
 months,
 Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn, son of Sikandar, seven years,
 Sultān Sultān-us-Salātīn, ten (?) years,
 Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, son of Sultān-us-Salātīn, three years,
 Rāja Kāns, ² three years,
 Sultan Jalāl-ud-dīn, son of Kāns, seventeen years,
 Sultān Ahmad, son of Jalāl-ud-dīn, sixteen years,
 Sultān Nāsī-ud-dīn, son of Ahmad, seven days,
 Sultān Nāsī Shāh, two years,
 Bārbak Shāh, seventeen years,
 Yūsuf Shāh, seven years,
 Sikandar Shāh, half a day,
 Fath-Shāh, seven years and some months,
 Bārbak Shāh, eunuch, two and a half months,
 Firūz Shāh, three years,
 Mahmūd Shāh, son of Firūz, one year,
 Muzaffar Habshī, three years and five months,
 'Alā-ud-dīn, twenty-seven years,
 Nasīb Shāh, son of 'Alā-ud-dīn, eleven years

(vol IV, p 351) calls him Nuseeb Poorby, and says he reigned from 1523 to 1538
 A D or for a period of fifteen years The Cambridge History of India calls him
 Nāsīr-ud dīn Nūsrat Shāh and gives him a reign of fifteen years from 1518 to
 1533 M Hidayat Hosain has eleven years as the period of his reign in the
 text edition, and this has been followed in the translation

The list in the Tabaqāt ends here, but Firishtah mentions four more Sultāns,
 and the Cambridge History of India thirteen more, ending with Dāud Khān
 Karārānī

¹ M Hidayat Hosain has adopted ۵۰ سال as the period of the reign in the
 text-edition

² In the text-edition M Hidayat Hosain has ۵۰ سال

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN FAKHR UD DĪN

Malik Fakhr ud dīn was the *silahdar* (armour bearer) of Qadr Khan. He treacherously slew his master and attributed the name of the *saltanat* to himself. He ² sent one of his slaves by the name of Mukhlis with a well equipped army to the frontier district of Bangala (افضای بنگالہ). ⁴ But Malik Ali Mubarak the pay master of Qadr

¹ One MS inserts Shah after Fakhr ud dīn

Firishtah describes in some detail the way in which Qadr Khan was murdered by his own soldiers at the instigation of Fakhr ud dīn and Stewart *History of Bengal* 1813 page 81 follows him. According to Stewart Fakhr Addeen proclaimed his independence at Sunergong about the end of 740 or the beginning of 741 and this is confirmed by his coins which also show that he continued to reign in Sonargaon till 750 A H. This agrees generally with the list of Bengal Kings on page 695 of the Cambridge History of India according to which he reigned from 739 A H to 750 A H. The Cambridge History of India page 26, differs from the *Tabaqat* and from Firishtah and Stewart. According to it Qadr Khan was not slain by or at the instigation of Fakhr ud dīn as he died in 1339 and was succeeded by Sultan Ala ud dīn. Ali as the Cambridge History of India calls him or Sultan Ala ud dīn Ali Shah. It is doubtful whether Bahram Khan who had been associated with Ghiyas ud dīn Bahadur in the government of Eastern Bengal and since the latter's rebellion and death in 1330 was the sole governor of East Bengal was or was not slain by Fakhr ud dīn but it was after his death in 1336 that Fakhr ud dīn or Fakhr ud dīn Mubarak Shah assumed the royal title at Sonargaon but Qadr Khan did not die till 1339 i.e. three years later at Lakhnauti.

³ According to Firishtah and Stewart he was sent to conquer Lakhnauti and the neighbouring districts.

⁴ Firishtah agrees as to Malik Ali having defeated Mukhlis but he says nothing about his defeating Fakhr ud dīn and putting him to death. Stewart (pp 8-83) agrees with the *Tabaqat* and says that Ali Mubarak defeated Fakhr Addeen and put him to death in 743 A H 1341 A D. This cannot however be correct as there are coins struck by him up to 749 A H in existence.

According to Firishtah he was taken prisoner in 741 A H by Malik Ilyas who assumed the title of Sultan Shams ud dīn and was brought to Lakhnauti where he was hanged by the neck. This also cannot be correct. The Cambridge History of India page 69 says that hostilities continued between Eastern and Western Bengal till 1349 A D when Fakhr ud dīn disappeared from the scene but he was succeeded by his son Ikhtiyar ud dīn Ghaz Shah at Sonargaon. This latter Sultan is not mentioned by Nizam ud dīn or Firishtah or Stewart but his coins show that he reigned at Sonargaon from 750 to 763 A H 1349-1355 A D. (See Bhatta's *Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent*

Khan's army, met him in battle, and slew him, and all his horses and other equipages which were with him fell into the victor's hands. As Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn had only newly acquired his power, and had no faith in his followers, he could not attack 'Alī Mubārak. In the end Malik 'Alī Mubārak assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and went and attacked Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn, and in the year 941 A.H. having taken him prisoner alive sentenced him to death. He then left a *thāna* (military post) at Lakhnautī, and returned to the country of Bangāla (probably Sōnārgāon).

The period of Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn's rule was two years and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN

As he had put Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn to death, he with great strength left a *thāna* at Lakhnautī and ¹ advanced towards Bangāla. ² After

Sultans of Bengal, 1922, pages 18, 19, and the Cambridge History of India, pp. 262, 695.) He is also mentioned by Edward Thomas, *The Chronicles of the Pathān Kings of Delhi*, 1871, pages 265, 266, and is included in Lane Poole's list in *The Mohammadan Dynasties*, 1925, page 307.

¹ The meaning is not clear. Firishṭah and Stewart are of no help. The former merely copies the words of the *Tabaqāt*, and the latter says nothing whatever about 'Alā ud-dīn. It appears, however, from Bhattasālī, page 15, and the Cambridge History of India, page 262, that 'Alā ud-dīn at this time removed his capital to Pandūah for strategic reasons. The *dujār* Bangāla would therefore mean Pandūah.

² There is a good deal of difference in the readings in the MSS. and the lith. ed., and they are all more or less incorrect. One MS. has *حاحي الياس علائى* که در لسكر لکهنوتی نامرد بوده، لسكر را حدود بارو موافق ساحتہ سلطان علائ الدین را کشت و خود را سلطان شمس الدین لقب گذاشته و چون سلطان علائ الدین دیار *حاحي الياس علائ الدین* the other MS. has *حاحي الياس علائى* instead of *حاحي الياس علائى*, and instead of *ساحتہ*, *ساحت*, and omits the words from *و خود دیار لکهنوتی و بنگالہ بتصرف گردید* to *و خود را* گذاشته، and then has *گردید* before *لکهنوتی*, and has *فرمودہ* instead of *بودہ* after *نامرد*, and *گذاشت* instead of *گذاشته* after *لقب* in the reading in the first MS., and inserts the words *شد* after *کستہ* *علائ الدین*, and *بارو* instead of *دیار* before *لکهنوتی*. The reading in the lith. ed. of Firishṭah is somewhat different.

a few days Malik ¹ Haji Ilyas Alaī who had been nominated (for the office of Sultan) in the army of Lakhnauti made that army friendly and united with him and slew Sultan Ala ud din and giving himself the title of Sultan Shams ud din *Bhangara* took possession of the country of Lakhnauti and Bangāla. The period of the government of Sultan Ala ud din was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF HAJI ILIYAS WHO HAD THE TITLE OF SULTAN SHAMS UD DIN *Bhangara*

When Ala ud din was slain and the whole country of Lakhnauti and Bangāla came into the possession of Ilyas he in concert with the *amirs* gave himself the title of Sultan Shams ud din and had public prayers read in his name. He made very great efforts in obtaining the good wishes of the people and in attracting the hearts of the soldiers.

After some time he equipped an army and marched to ² Jajnagar and having obtained many large elephants from that country returned

I have adopted the reading in the first MS changing گداسه to گداسب and inserting the words *سلطان لاء الدین* after گداسب. M. Hidayat Hoain has generally followed the second MS in the text edition.

¹ The relationship of Malik Haji Ilyas with Sultan Ala ud din and their antecedent as detailed in the *Riyazu's Salatin* are given on pages 19-20 of Bhattasali's book. I do not think that Firishlah and Firishlah are correct in saying that Malik Haji Ilyas gave himself the title of Sultan Shams ud-din Bhangara. The last word was a nick-name popularly given to him on account of his addiction to the preparation of beer known as *Bhang*. According to Firishlah Hajipur opposite to Patna got its name from Haji Ilyas.

The heading given in the text is that in the MSS with the slight difference that the last word is داسه in one MS and داسب in the other. The latter is correct. The heading in the lithed is دگر سلطان شمس الدین بھنگر.

² Neither the *Riyazu's Salatin* nor the *Tabaqat* nor Firishlah attempts to identify this place. Bhattasali (pp. 24-5) says Sultan Shams ud-din seems to have levied tribute from the kingdoms of Orissa and Tirhut from which it appears that he identifies Jajnagar with Orissa. The Cambridge History of India page 63 says Ilyas is said to have invaded Jajnagar as the Muslim historians styled the kingdom of Jajpur in Orissa. There is no connected account of this kingdom anywhere in the Cambridge History of India and it is only mentioned incidentally in this place and in connection

to his own capital. ¹ For a period of thirteen ² years and some months, the Sultāns of Dehli did not interfere with him in any way, and he with full and absolute authority, performed the duties of the *saltanat*. But on the 10th of Shawwāl, in the year 754 A H, ³ Sultān Firūz Shāh, son of Rajab advanced from Dehli towards Lakhnautī Sultān

with Sultān Hūshang's journey to acquire elephants on page 350 and the following pages, and in connection with Sultān Muhammad of the Deccan's invasion of Orissa in 1478 on page 117. In all these places the Musalmān historians call the place Jājnagar, and the Cambridge History of India persists, so far as I can see, without any authority whatever in calling it Jājpur. Apart, however, from this question I think that the Jājnagar mentioned here does not mean Orissa at all, but Tipperah. Stewart, on page 83, has Tippera in brackets after Jagenagar (Jājnagar). He gives no authority but Shams Addcen, with his capitals at Pandūah and Sōnūrgāon, is more likely to have invaded Tipperah, less than one hundred miles from Sōnūrgāon than Orissa which was quite five hundred or six hundred miles off. It will be seen moreover that Sultān Ghiyās ud dīn Balban pursued the rebel Tughlral in the direction of Jājnagar through Lakhnautī and Sonargāon see pages 109 and 110 of the first volume of the translation. The Jājnagar mentioned there cannot be identified with Orissa, but must be some place east of Sōnūrgāon and most probably Tipperah. In this connection see also note 1, page 101 of the English translation of the Riāzu-s Salātīn, where the translator says, that he was inclined to agree with Professor Blochmann, that there were two Jajnagar-, one in Orissa and another towards Tipperah.

¹ The Riāzu s Salātīn (text edition, p 96) says تدریج تا حدود و بنارس تا سیرده سال سلاطین دهلی متعری حال ننگاله شدید and earlier on متصرف گردید and hence Firūz Shāh's attention was directed to Bangāla and he attempted to reconquer it.

² One MS omits by mistake the word سال years.

³ One MS has سلطان فیروز شاه while the other MS, and the lith ed leave out the word بن. The first MS is correct. Sultān Firūz Shāh was the son of *Sipāh-sālār* Rajab, brother of Sultān Ghiyās-ud dīn Tughluq.

Bhattasālī (p 25) cannot understand how the Tabakat gives a detailed diary (as he calls it) of the expedition, when neither Shams i Sirāj Afif nor Zia-Barnī the two contemporary historians go into details of dates. The account of the expedition as given in the Tabaqāt is translated on pages 244, 245 of the first volume of this work. Zia 'Barnī's Tarīkh i-Firūz Shāhī is not before me, but it appears from note 3, pages 100, 101, of Maulavī Abdus Salām's translation of the Riāzu-s Salātīn, that Zia 'Barnī gives a full account of the expedition, and all facts mentioned in the Tabaqāt are to be found in it.

Shams ud din took shelter in the fort of ¹ Ekdala and left the whole country of Bangala unoccupied (i.e. ungarrisoned)

When Sultān Firuz heard that Sultān Shams ud din had fortified himself in Ekdala he advanced from the road towards that place. When he arrived in its neighbourhood Sultān Shams ud din sallied out of the fort and engaged in a regular battle and many were slain on both sides. Sultān Shams ud din fled and again took shelter in Ekdala. The large elephants which he had brought from Jainagar fell into the hands of Sultān Firuz Shah's men.

As the rains had commenced and there was heavy rain Sultān Firuz Shah returned on the 1st of Rabi' ul awwal to Delhi. After that in the year 750 A.H. Sultān Shams ud din sent a large quantity of tribute such as might be fit for the ² Sultān with his ambassadors as homage to Firuz Shah and prayed for pardon. Sultān Firuz Shah also behaving with kindness conferred robes of honour on the ambassadors and granted them permission to ⁴ depart.

Again about the end of the ⁵ year 750 A.H. Sultān Shams ud din sent Malik Taj ud din to Delhi with much tribute and Sultān Firuz

¹ As to the position of Ekdala see the excellent note - on page 100 of the English translation of the *Rizzu's Salatin*. In Barni says: "It is the name of a moula close to Panduah on one side of it is a river and on another a jungle. Shamsi Siraj call it The isles of Ekdalah." I may note here that the name is transliterated in the Cambridge History of India page 63 as Ik-dala. No Indian will however pronounce the name with an initial I.

² The *Rizzu's Salatin* (p. 100) however says that Sultān Shamsu d din left his son with an army in the fort of Panduah. The son however was soon taken prisoner. According to the *Riaz* also there was a great battle on the day Firuz Shah arrived near Ekdala after which the siege was continued for twenty two days.

³ One MS. in crs. مغلّس before سلاطین. Firishtah lith. ed. also has لا مغلّس ناسالان.

⁴ One MS. has انطرف by mistake for انصراف.

⁵ The *Rizzu's Salatin* has 758 A.H. 759 A.H. appears to be incorrect. Bhattasali (pp. 41-4) enters into a long disquisition on the subject and comes to the conclusion that Sultan Shamsuddin died about the end of Zul hijjah 758. The Cambridge History of India page 63 discusses the question as to whether or not Firuz acknowledged the independence of Sultan Shams ud din. It comes to the conclusion that Firuz Shah had to return without obtaining a formal declaration of Shams ud din's homage. It also says that the tributes

Shāh treated the ambassador with greater kindness than before, and after some days, sent Arab and Turkī horses with other fine presents for Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, with Malik Sāif-ud-dīn, the superintendent of the elephants. Malik Sāif-ud-dīn and Malik Tāj-ud-dīn had not yet passed through Behār, when Sultān Shams-ud-dīn died. Malik Sāif-ud-dīn ¹ gave the horses to the *amīns* of Behār, in accordance with the emperor's order and ² Malik Sāif-ud-dīn himself went back to Dehlī.

The period of the rule of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn was sixteen years and some months.

³ AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN

When Sultān Shams-ud-dīn ⁴ departed (this life) the *amīns* and the chiefs of the different groups on the third day after his death,

sent by Shams-ud-dīn in 755 A.H., 1354 A.D. and 758 A.H., 1358 A.D. were merely the customary exchanges of presents, but it should be noted in both instances that the presents or tributes were sent from Bengāl. It appears to me that the relations between the two rulers remained undefiant, and I cannot find any evidence in support of the statement made in the Cambridge History of India (p. 263) that "In December 1356, Firūz formally recognised the independence of Bengal."

¹ The *Riyāzu's Salātīn* (text edition, p. 99) says در عوض مواحب سپاهیان بهار متعینه, i.e., in lieu of the pay due to the imperial soldiers stationed in Behār.

² Both MSS. have Malik Tāj-ud-dīn instead of Malik Sāif-ud-dīn. This is incorrect.

³ There are slight differences in the heading. It is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply ذکر سکندر شاه. The lith. ed. has the same heading as the first MS., with the exception that it omits the word شاه after سکندر.

⁴ One MS. has رحلت نمود instead of رحلت نمود. The relations between the rulers of Dehlī and Bengāl at this time are extremely obscure. The *Riyāzu's Salātīn*, the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* all begin abruptly by saying that Sultān Sikandar considered it extremely important to conciliate Firūz Shāh, without saying anything about the relations between Sultān Shams-ud-dīn and Firūz Shāh, after the latter's first expedition to Bengāl. According to the *Tarikh-i-Firūz Shāhī* by Shams Sirāj Afif, the object of the second expedition was to reinstate Zafar Khān on the throne of Sōnārgāon, but that work is also silent about the relation between Firūz Shāh and Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, just before the latter's death. According to Bhattasālī (p. 44) after the experi-

placed his eldest son on the throne of empire giving him the title of Sikandar Shah. He proclaimed the gospel of justice and beneficence

ences of his first expedition to Lal hnauti Firuz Shah was in no mood again to interfere in the internal affairs of Bengal but he had to take cognizance of the complaint of Zafar Khan who arrived in Delhi in 758 A.D. as he was the latter's liege lord but he was at least according to Bhattasali apparently afraid of Sulṭān Shams ud dīn and it was not till the news of the latter's death had come to Delhi that he finally made up his mind and began to prepare for marching against the unsuspecting Sikandar Bhattasali (p. 48) goes on to say that according to the Riyāz and Firihtah Sikandar was ignorant of the motive of Firuz Shah in thus hurrying towards Bengal even when Firuz reached Zafarabad (near Jaunpur). I do not consider this latter statement correct. Even immediately after his accession Sikandar knew that it was extremely important for him to conciliate Firuz Shah. This is expressly mentioned in the Riyāz and the Talaqit and by Firishtah. As to Sikandar's not knowing the motive of Firuz Shah's march toward Bengal (Firuz was certainly not hurrying for taking the date given by Bhattasali himself he commenced his preparation in 753 A.D. started in Muharram 760 A.D. and arrived in Jaunpur about Jamādī ul Awwal 760 A.D. and halted there for six months and the siege of Ekdaia did not commence till Zī qa'ia 760 and did not end till Jamādī ul Awwal 761 A.D.). This snail-like march contrasts very unfavourably with the first expedition in the course of which Firuz Shah reached Ekdaia in three days less than five months after leaving Delhi; he must have been both very ignorant and very dense. It is not quite correct to say that the Riyāz and Firihtah say that Sikandar was ignorant of Firuz Shah's motive even when the latter arrived at Zafarabad. The former says that he was *متردد* or anxious but that does not mean that he was ignorant. *Firishtah does not even say this*.

The Cambridge History of India (page 563) gives a different view of the matter. According to it in December 1356 A.D. as already noted Firuz formally recognised the independence of Bengal but apparently he intended to treat this recognition as so much waste paper. He accordingly as soon as the news of the death of Shams ud dīn reached him ordered the gift to the latter to be distributed among the nobles of Bihar and recalled Saif ud dīn to assist in the preparation for an invasion of Bengal. I do not know what the authority for this statement is. None of the chroniclers or historians say so. But though Firuz Shah wanted to brush aside his declaration of December 1356 A.D. he was apparently unable to do so without a pretext and this was furnished by the arrival of Zafar Khan.

It is unnecessary to labour this point further. I consider that Firuz Shah thought that he was entitled to reannex Bengal to the empire of Delhi and he made a second attempt to do so.

and occupied himself with the duties of the *saltanat*. Knowing that seeking the pleasure of the heart of Sultān Fīrūz Shāh was of the greatest importance, he sent fifty elephants and various stuffs in the way of tribute to Sultān Fīrūz Shāh. In the meanwhile, the latter had advanced towards Lakhnautī in the year 760 A.H. with the object of conquering Bangāla. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Pāndūa, Sultān Sikandar following the example of his father, fortified himself in his citadel of Ekdāla.¹ As he had not the strength to oppose him (i.e., Fīrūz Shāh), he agreed to pay an annual tribute and turned the Sultān back. The latter was yet in the neighbourhood of Pandūa, when Sikandar sent thirty-seven elephants and many valuable things and various kinds of stuff to the Sultān, and prayed for the pardon of his offences. Then following the example of his father, he passed the whole of his life in pleasure and² enjoyment. The period of his rule

¹ The *Riyāzu-s Salātīn* and *Firishtah* agree. Stewart (p. 85) also agrees, but he says that Emperor Feroze found out that there was no probability of his being able to capture Akdala. Bhattasali (pp. 50, 51) says Sultan Firoz returned discomfited and says, that he and not Sultan Sikandar sought for peace. It appears, however, that proposals for peace were sent by Sikandar's ministers, who, by their master's silence to imply his consent to their being sent, and Fīrūz's ministers received them with great joy, and had no difficulty in persuading their masters to listen to them. Firoz, however, stipulated for the restoration of Sonargaon to Zafar Khan, but the latter did not dare to resume sovereignty in the dangerous proximity of Sikandar.

The Cambridge History of India, page 264, practically agrees with the above.

² The *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* are silent about some very important incidents of the life of Sikandar. The *Riyāzu-s Salātīn* (p. 105) mentions them. One of these is the erection of the Adina Mosque in Panduah, which is perhaps the finest and most remarkable religious edifice in Bengal. Unfortunately it remained unfinished at the time of his death.

The second is the rebellion of *Ghiyāsu d dīn*, who afterwards succeeded him. It is said that Sikandar had two wives, one of whom had seventeen sons, while *Ghiyāsu d dīn* was the only son of the other. The latter, in the words of the *Riyāzu-s Salātīn* (text edition, pp. 101-104) was *در همه احوال و اوصاف بر همه برادران فایق و در امور سلطنت و جهانداری اسب و لایق* which may be translated as superior to all his brothers in the beauty of his morals and in all (good) qualities, and the fittest and most meritorious in the arts of sovereignty. His step mother, however, complained to the Sultān against him and suggested that he should either be put into prison, or deprived of his

was ¹ nine years and some months

² AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN GHIYĀS UD DĪN ³

⁴ When Sultān Sikandar died the *amirs* and the chiefs of the different groups of the people gave the title of Sultān Ghiyas ud dīn

sight The Sultan reproved her and put the government in Ghiyasu d dīn's hands The latter was however afraid of his step mother's machinations and one day on the pretext of hunting escaped to Sunargaon He collected an army there and the Sultan marched to meet him A battle took place at Coalpara which appears to be near Jafarganj in the Dacca district and nearly opposite to the junction of the Ganges and Jabuna or Jamuna Ghiyasu d dīn is said to have given strict orders that Sultan Sikandar should be taken alive but as it was decreed otherwise he was mortally wounded Ghiyasu d dīn hastened to the place and took his father's head in his lap and tears trickled down his cheeks Sikandar then opened his eyes and said My life's work is over the kingdom is welcome to thee

¹ This is not correct He actually reigned from 708 A H 1307 A D to 795 A H 1393 A D or for thirty six or thirty seven years Bhattasālī (p 7-) is inclined to place his death in October 1393 A D

The heading is as I have in the text in the MSS The lith ed adds سلطان سکندر after Sultan Ghiyas ud dīn

³ Unlike the Muhammadan historians the Cambridge History of India page 264 calls this Sultan Ghiyas ud dīn A zam and later A zam It appears to follow Bhattasālī who on page 8 calls him Ghiyasuddin A zam Shah and a few lines further down A zam Shah It is true that the full name of the Sultan on his coins was Ghiyas ud dīn Abul Muzaffar A zam Shah but I see no reason for calling him by any name other than Ghiyas ud dīn

⁴ The account of this reign is even briefer in Firishtah and what there is is copied almost *verbatim* from the Tabaqat Notwithstanding the praise of the author of the Riyaz Sultan Ghiyas ud dīn's first act was to get the eyes of his seventeen brothers dug out and by a refinement of cruelty to send them to their mother

He is more pleasantly remembered as the correspondent of the illustrious poet Hafiz of Shiraz The correspondence is said to have commenced in the following way He had a very serious illness and when he had no hope of recovery he directed that three of his concubines who were named respectively the *sarv* (the cypress) the *gul* (the rose) and the *lala* (the tulip) should perform the last bathing ceremony The other inmates of the harem used to taunt the *sarv* and her companions by the name of *عساله* (*ghassala* or corpse washer)

to his son and seated him on the throne in the place of his father. He also following the rule of his father and the custom of his grandfather passed the whole of his life in pleasure and enjoyment, and ¹ in the year 775 A H passed away from the narrow place of the body to the wide spaces of the spirit.

The period of his rule was seven ² years and some months.

After his recovery, when he was in a jovial mood the Sultān recited the line
 سافى حديدہ سرو و گل و لاله ميرود None of the court poets could make another line to match it, so the Sultān sent it to Hāfiz by a special messenger. The latter quickly sent the second line
 اس بے با دلائل عالمه ميرود He also sent a whole *ghazl* (ode) beginning with these lines. The Sultān sent him many valuable presents and invited him to his court, but Hāfiz could not come. The word *ghassāla* also means a morning draught, so the double *entendre* is extremely witty (*vide* Cambridge History of India, pp 264, 265 and Rīyāz, p 109).

Another anecdote also shows the Sultān in a pleasing light. He is said to have wounded the only son of a widow while practising with his bow and arrow. The widow went and complained to *Qādī* Shīāj-ud dīn. The latter summoned the Sultān to appear before him. The officer sent to serve the summons could not get admission into the palace, but he used the device of calling the *adhān*. The Sultān ordered the man who had made this untimely call to be brought before him. When the man was brought to him, he produced the summons. The Sultān at once went with him, taking a short sword under his arm. When he appeared before the *Qādī*, the latter told him to satisfy the widow. The Sultān did so, and when on the *Qādī's* asking the widow, she stated that she was quite satisfied, the *Qādī* rose from his seat, and seated the Sultān on the *masnad*. The Sultān then eulogized the *Qādī*, but producing the sword, said that if he had found the *Qādī* afraid to administer justice he would have cut off his head with it. The *Qādī* then produced a scourge which he had kept concealed under his *masnad*, and said that if he had found the Sultān unwilling to satisfy the widow he would have sacrificed his back with it. As the Cambridge History of India (p 265) says, "Bengal can boast of a prince more law abiding than Henry of Monmouth, and of a judge at least as firm as Gascoigne."

¹ This also is incorrect. He actually reigned from 795 A H, 1393 A D, to 813 A H, 1410 A D, or for seventeen or eighteen years. The Rīyāz (p 111) gives seven years and some months as the period of his reign, but adds that according to another account it lasted for sixteen years, five months and three days.

² According to the Rīyāz, page 111, he was slain by deceit and treachery by Rājā Kāns who was a zemindar of the neighbourhood.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN US SALĀTĪN

When Sultan Chiyas ud dīn departed (from the world) the *amirs* raised his son on the throne of the empire giving him the title of Sultan us salāṭīn. He was a merciful and patient and brave ruler and went away in the year 795 from the waste place of this world to the populous country of the next life.

He reigned for ten years.

³ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS UD DĪN

As Sultān us salāṭīn went from the house of this world to the house of the after life the *amirs* and the chief men of the State gave the

¹ That is the heading in the MSS and in the lith ed. In the Riyāz p 111 he is called Saif ud dīn who had the title of Sultānu s salāṭīn.

The account of this reign in the Riyāz pages 111-11 agrees generally with the text but it says that according to one account his reign lasted for three years seven months and five days and not ten days. Firishtah al o agrees but says the *amirs* and *ta'irs* were amazed (در حساب بودند) where حساب is probably a mistake for حارب (opposition to the *Shara*) and the Rays of the country around never drew their heads from the circle of his obedience and never made any delay or objection in paying the proper revenue. Firishtah al o says in one place that he carried on the government for ten years but in another place he says the period of his rule was seven years and some months. Col Brigg's account (vol IV p 330) agrees with that in the text and not with that in the lith ed of Firishtah. According to Bhattasālī (page 90) Saifuddin was king only in name. The real power seems to have passed to Raja Ganesh. He also comes to the conclusion after considering his coins and the synchronisms of the Chinese Annals that his reign lasted only for one year and some months in 813 A H and the whole of 814 A H (p 98). According to the Cambridge History of India page 66 he is said to have peacefully succeeded his father to have had an obscure reign to have been defeated in 1404 by Ganesh but to have continued to reign till his death in 1406.

³ The heading is as I have it in the text in the MSS. In the lith ed it is ذکر بر سلطان السلاطین بنی سلطان سمس الدین. Firishtah al o calls the son and successor of Saif ud dīn Hamza Shah or Sultan us salāṭīn Sultan Shams ud dīn II. In the heading in the Riyāz p 11 he is al o called Sultan Shamsu d dīn son of Sultānu s salāṭīn but it is stated a few lines further down that Shamsu d dīn was not the son but the adopted son of Sultānu s salāṭīn and his name was Shahabu d dīn and not Shamsu d dīn. It goes on to say that Rajah Kans attacked and slew him and assumed the name of Sultan. It appears to be uncertain as far as our present information goes as to what the actual political

title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn to his son, and placed him on the ¹ throne of the empire. He also following the custom of his ancestors passed his whole life in pleasure, and in the year 790 A H, he passed away.

The period of his reign was three years and some months.

² AN ACCOUNT OF RĀJA KĀNS

When Sultān Shams-ud-dīn died, a *zamīndār* of the name of Kāns acquired power and dominion over the country of Bangāla. As the just and holy God ³ was kind to his son, the latter became a Musalmān and sat on the throne.

situation in Bengal was at the time, i.e., between 813 and 810 A H, but it appears that Shamsu d dīn or Shahābu d dīn was only a king in name and the entire authority was vested on Raja Ganesh or Kāns of Bhaduria. He appears, according to Bhattasālī (p. 99), to have been supported on the throne by the Raja as harmless, and not likely to interfere with his own authority and also to keep down the legitimate Ilyas Shahis. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, says that Saif-ud dīn Hamza Shāh was succeeded by Shams ud dīn, who was permitted to ascend the throne but exercised no power, and died after a reign of little more than three years. He was succeeded by another puppet Shihāb-ud dīn Bāyazīd. In the list of the kings of Bengal on page 695 the name of Shams-ud-dīn does not appear at all, but Shihāb ud dīn Bāyazīd succeeded him in 815, and appears to have reigned for two years. The two accounts contradict each other. The account on page 266 appears to be incorrect. Shamsu d-dīn and Shahābu d dīn which are two names given in the Riyāz, page 112, to the same man, have been given to two men, one of whom did not exist at all. It may be mentioned, however, that Lane-Poole has both Shams al-dīn and Shihāb-al dīn in his list on page 307.

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ, but the other MS. has ارانک.

² The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other MS. it is simply راحت کانس. In the lith. ed. it is ذکر حکومت کانس.

³ The readings are slightly different. The reading in the MS. is not very clear, but appears to be سر اورا کفایت کرد, the meaning of which is not at all clear. The lith. ed. has very distinctly بسر اورا کفایت کرد, the meaning of which is also obscure. کفایت کردن means to suffice, to serve, to do, also to spare. The meaning of the reading in the MSS. may be "undid his wickedness", and that of the reading in the lith. ed., "was kind to his son", but I am not sure of either of these.

The Tabaqāt gives no information of as to the events of the reign of the Kāns or Ganēsh, and of his attitude towards the Musalmāns. The Riyāz, p. 113, says he persecuted them, and murdered many of them, including many

The period of the power of Kāns was seven years

learned and holy men such as Shāikh Badrul I lām on of Shāikh Munu d dīn Abbas Then the saintly Nur Qutbu l Alam wrote to Sultan Ibrahim Sharq to come and invade Bengal and save the Musalmans of the country from the persecution of the cruel and inhuman *lāfir* Ibrahim Sharq accordingly invaded Bengal and encamped at Firuzpur (ie Ianduah) Kāns then went to the saint and begged him to intercede in his favour so that Sultan Ibrahim might go back The saint refused to do so unless he consented to accept Islam but his wife refused to allow him to do so Upon this he brought his son Jadu who was then twelve years of age and said I have now become too old and have little to do with this world but I have brought my son and offer him a proselyte to Islam Then the saint took some *pan* which he was chewing out of his mouth and put it into the boy's mouth and made him recite the creed of Musalman faith After that he persuaded Sultan Ibrahim much against his will to go back to Jaunpur where he died shortly after this After his death Kāns again commenced his persecution of the Musalmans He also tried to make Jadu a Hindu again by passing him through a golden image of a cow portions of which were afterward given to Brahmans He commenced to persecute and kill the servants and relations of Nur Qutbu l Alam himself He even put the son of the saint who was named Shāikh Anwar to death but he himself died at the very time when Shāikh Anwar became a martyr (pp 113-116)

The account given by Firūhtah is entirely different According to it although Rājā Kāns never became a Musalman he mixed much with and had great love for the followers of the faith so much so that many believed him to have become a Musalman and wanted to bury his dead body

The account in the Rivāz has been accepted by historians in preference to that of Firūhtah It appears from Bhatta alī's account (pp 117-119) that it is substantially correct the only serious mistake in it being the statement that Ganeśh or Kāns resumed sovereign power after the death of Sultan Ibrahim Sharq As a matter of fact Sultan Ibrahim Sharq died long after the death of Rājā Ganeśh which took place in 811 A H 1418 A D which is the last coin of Danujamarddana Deva (title assumed by Ganesh after his second accession) and also of Mahendra Deva's coins from Pandua and Chittagong Mahendra Deva was the title assumed by Jadu or Jalaluddin after his second accession after the death of his father and before his second conversion to Islam Sultan Ibrahim Sharq died in 840 A H 1436 A D It would appear that Ganeśh resumed his power after the death of Nur Kutab Alam when he began his second persecution of the Musalmans and banished and afterwards put to death Nur Kutab Alam's son Shāikh Anwar After this he assumed the title of Danujamarddana Deva and coins were struck by him in 870 A H in Chittagong Sonargaon and Iandua and in 811 A H in Pandua have been

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN JALĀL-UD-DĪN, SON OF KĀNS

As Kāns went to his original abode (i.e., I suppose hell), his ² son, owing to his love of rule became a Musalmān, and assumed the name of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn. The people were contented and happy during his time, and at the end of the year 812 ³ A.H. he passed away.

The period of his reign was seventeen years.

found. Coins of Mahendia Deva bearing the date 821 A.H., and struck at Pandua and Chittagong have also been found.

The Cambridge History of India (pp. 266, 267) agrees generally with Bhattacharya, but it does not mention Danujamarddana Deva or Mahendra Deva, and according to it Ganesh died in 817 A.H., 1414 A.D., and Jadū or Jalāl-ud-dīn succeeded him in that year.

¹ There are slight differences in the heading. The heading in the text is that in the lith. ed. One MS. has the same heading up to بنى bin, but has left out the word Kāns by mistake. The other MS. has simply an account of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn.

² Both MSS. omit the word ^{بنى} after ^{بنى}.

³ The year in both MSS. is ^{بنى} ^{بنى}. The lith. ed. has ^{بنى}. Both are incorrect. He died in 834 or 835 A.H. Some account of him has been given in note 2, page 859 of the type script. The Tabaqāt says the people were contented and happy in his reign. The Riyāz, p. 118, gives a different account. According to it he converted many infidels to Islām, and forced the Brahmins who had partaken of portions of the golden image of the cow to eat beef. He became a disciple of Shaikh Zāhid, grandson of Nūr Qutbu-l-'Alam, and nephew of Shaikh Anwar. It is also said, of course, that people were happy and contented, and the population of Panduah became very large, and he erected a mosque, etc., in Gaur, and the re-population of Gaur commenced in his time.

Firishtah's account is different. He gives him the name of Jaimal and says that he offered to abdicate in favour of his younger brother, if the chief men of the country objected to him, on the ground of his being a Musalmān, but they in an extremely tolerant way said, that religion did not in any way affect worldly affairs. According to Firishtah also he became the Nūshīrwān of the age, i.e., the ideally just ruler.

Bhattacharya (p. 112) says he became zealous Muhammadan, converted many to the Musalman Faith, recalled Shaikh Zahid from Sonargaon and showed him every respect. He also quotes Firishtah's account, and it appears that the copy of Firishta from which he quoted gives Jeetmal as his Hindu name.

The Cambridge History of India, page 267, says "He persecuted the Hindus, as his father had persecuted the Muslims and hosts of

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN AHMAD SON OF SULTĀN JALĀL UD DĪN

As the inevitable happened to Sultān Jalal ud dīn the *amirs*

Hindus are said to have been forcibly converted to Islam. It also considers it probable that the present numerical superiority of Muslims in Eastern Bengal is due to an immense wave of proselytisation (which) must have swept over the country and it is most probable that the period was the reign of Jalal ud dīn Muhammad.

It appears to me however that the numerical superiority of the Musalmans in Eastern Bengal exists chiefly among Musalmans of the lower classes and low caste Hindus (many of whom were untouchables) did not require much persuasion or persecution to accept a religion according to which they might claim equality with the best.

¹ The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. and in the lith ed. In the other MS. Ahmad Shah is substituted for Sultan Ahmad. As to the event of this reign Firishtah copies the *Tabaqat* word for word but unfortunately adds a few words of his own which are totally opposed to the facts as given by the *Riyaz*. These words are *او سر بر روی بدر بر گوار نموده بداد و دشمن کوسنده حلالی* *سوارا عربی انعام و احسان گرداند*. Stewart (p. 96) agrees with Firishtah as to the impartial administration of justice by Ahmed Shah and adds that both the followers of Mohammed and the worshippers of idols lived in their attachment to his person. He also says that during his reign Sultan Ibrahim of Joannepore invaded Bengal and plundered several districts and carried away many of the inhabitants as slaves. Ahmed Shah unable to contend with him sent an ambassador to Shah Rookh the son of Timour at Herat. The latter wrote a letter to Sultan Ibrahim threatening exemplary vengeance if he did not immediately release the captives and again molested the King of Bengal. After that Sultan Ibrahim never again invaded Bengal. An extract from Shah Rookh's letter is given by Stewart who says the letter is taken from Firishtah and adds that the circumstances of the embassy are also confirmed in the

Mulla Asaeddine a very eloquent Persian history of Shah Rookh.

There is no mention of the letter in Firishtah lith ed. or in Col Briggs's history and no mention of this invasion of Bengal by Sultān Ibrahim in any other history.

The *Riyaz* pages 118-119 gives a very different account of Ahmad Shah. He was very harsh tempered tyrannical and blood thirsty and shed unrighteous blood and used to cut open the bodies of pregnant women. When his barbarities reached an extreme point two of his slaves *Shadi Khan* and *Nasir Khan* who had attained to the rank of nobility conspired together and brought about his death.

Bhattasali's account terminates with the history of Jalaluddin.

The Cambridge History of India says little is known of his reign and then mentions the aggressions of Ibrahim Sharqi and the remonstrance of Shah

bestowed the ¹ title of Sultān Ahmad on his son and made him the successor of his father. ² In the end of the year 830 A H , he sought ³ release from bodily restraints and joined the spiritual existence
The period of his reign was sixteen years

⁴ AN ACCOUNT OF NĀSIR THE SLAVE

⁵ When the throne of sovereignty remained unoccupied after the death of Sultān Ahmad, son of Jalāl-ud-dīn, a slave of his named Nāsir placed his foot with great audacity on the throne of the empire, and commenced to issue all orders The *amīrs* and *Malīks* of Sultān Ahmad put him to death, and raised one of the grandsons of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara* to be the ruler

The period of his rule was seven days, and, according to another account, half a day

⁶ AN ACCOUNT OF NĀSIR SHAH

When Nāsir *Ghulām* (the slave) was put to death, they found out one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara*, and placing him on the throne of the empire ⁷ gave him the title of Nāsir

rukh and goes on to say that towards the end of his reign his tyranny, became unbearable, and he was put to death by Shādi Khān and Nāsir Khān Nāsir Khān forestalled his fellow conspirator, and put him to death and assumed the sovereignty of Bengal (p 267)

¹ One MS has فرار , by mistake, for اہل

² Both MSS have واحر در سہ , while the lith ed has در آخر سہ I have retained the reading in the lith ed

³ One MS has حلاص , the other omits the word by mistake, while the lith ed has حلاصی I have accepted حلاص

⁴ The reading in one MS is as I have it in the text In the other MS Nāsir-ud-dīn is substituted for Nāsir The lith ed has ذکر حکومت ناصر الدین an account of the rule of Nāsir-ud-dīn

⁵ The Rīyāz, Fīrishtah, Col Briggs and Stewart all agree generally The Cambridge History of India, page 267, contrary to all the other authorities, makes Nāsir the slave and Nāsir ud dīn Mahmūd one and the same person Lane-Poole (p 308) also has Nāsir-al dīn Mahmūd Shāh II, who was apparently the slave, and also the first Sultān of the house of *Ilyās* (restored) apparently as one and the same person

⁶ The heading in the text is the heading in both MSS The lith ed inserts the word حکومت , rule, before Nāsir Shāh

⁷ One MS and the lith ed have دادہ , but the other MS has دادہ

Shah All classes of men common and noble and great and small were happy and contented in the cradle of peace and safety And in the end in the year 862 A H he passed away

The period of his reign was ¹ two years

AN ACCOUNT OF BARBAK SHĀH

When Nasir Shah died the *amirs* and the great men of the country seated Barbak Shah on the throne of sovereignty In his time the residents of the city and the soldiery were in a state of contentment He also passed his time in pleasure and enjoyment When the period of his life and the days of his existence came to an end in the year 879 A H he ² passed away

¹ Both the MSS and the lith ed have two years This is manifestly incorrect The period from 830 A H the year of the death of Sultan Ahmad to 86 A H the year of Nasir Shah's death is thirty two years The *در* in the text is a mistake for *سی و دو* or 32 The accounts of this reign as given in the Riyaz and by Firishtah Col Briggs and Stewart generally agree with the text The Riyaz page 120 adds that he erected some of the buildings and the fort of Gaur As to the length of his reign he says that it was thirty two years but according to others did not exceed twenty seven years Stewart (p 100) also says that he constructed the fortification round the city of Gour

As to the Cambridge History of India see note on page 416 According to it the period of his reign was seventeen years from 846 to 864 A H 1441 to 1460 A D

² The heading in both MSS is as I have in the text The lith ed inserts the word *salānat* before Barbak Shah The Riyaz (text edition p 118) agree generally as to the account of this reign but adds *مرد دا و مسرع بود* It appears from a note on page 120 of Salam a translation of the Riyaz that his full name was Ruknu d dīn Abul Mujahid Barbak Shāh that he reigned from 864 A H and that before that he was governor of south west Bengal in 860 A H Firishtah copies the Tabaqat as regards the early part of the account but adds that he was the first sovereign of India who employed Abyssinians and raised them to high rank Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Stewart has anything new about him but both mention his employment of the Abyssinians The Cambridge History of India (p 968) says he reigned from 1459 to 1474 A D or for fifteen years

³ One MS and the lith ed have *رحل نمود* but the other MS has *سروع در مرحله پیمایی عالم بسنی کرد* This MS is very imperfect here The words quoted are taken from the latter part of the accounts of the reign of Yusuf Shāh the next Sultān the earlier part of the account of whose reign is altogether omitted in it

² AN ACCOUNT OF YŪSUF SHĀH

The period of his sovereignty was seven years and six months

⁴ After the death of Yūsuf Shāh, 'the *amīns* and *razīs* placed

The account of this reign in the *Tabaqūt* appears to be copied from the *Riyāz* (text edition, p 119) which adds the virtues of being *عالم و ریاضت*, i.e., learned and abstemious, to those mentioned in the *Tabaqūt* and explains *عز و حوا* by adding the word *فاق*. His full name appears to have been Shams ud dīn Abul Muzaffar Yūsuf Shāh, and he appears to have reigned from 879 A.H. According to *Fuṣṣṭah* he was very strict in the observance of the law of the Prophet. Stewart (p 101) says he was very strict about the administration of justice, and enjoined on all judges to act with the strictest impartiality. The *Cambridge History of India* (p 268) calls him "a precisian."

⁴ One MS and the lith ed have بعد ارموب. The other MS omits the word ارموب.

⁵ There are differences in the readings. One MS has امرأ ووراءى تعمق بطار. This I have adopted. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has the same

Sikandar Shah on the throne of the empire without careful enquiries

¹ As he did not possess the qualifications or the right of being invested with this high office they removed him from it and raised Fath Shah to the chieftainship

The period of Sikandar Shah's reign was two ³ and a half days

4 AN ACCOUNT OF FATH SHĀH

After the deposition of Sikandar Shah the *amirs* and the great men raised Fath Shah to the chieftainship and placed him on the throne of the empire. He was intelligent and wise and placing the usages of ancient rulers and Sultāns in the forefront of his spirit distributed

word. The other MS has *امرا و ورزای بعد از آمدن و بمعنی نظر*. The lith ed has *امرا و ورزای بمعنی نظر*.

¹ Here again the readings are different. One MS has *حسن استحقاق بعد*. I have adopted this but have changed *عمر* which is manifestly incorrect for *امر*. The other MS omits the word *استحقاق* and substitutes *امر* for *عمر*. The lith ed omits the word *بعد* and has *ال امر* *ال امر*.

One MS has by mistake *بردارای برداسند*.

³ M Hidayat Hosain has *نیم روز* half a day in the text edition.

⁴ Here again the heading in the MSS is as I have it in the text but the lith ed inserts the word *salṭanat* before the name of Fath Shah.

The Riyāz (p. 119) says he was another son of Yusuf Shah. Otherwise the Tabaqat agrees with it. His full name was Jalāl ud din Abul Muzaffar Fath Shah. He is said to have reigned from 887 to 896 A.H. but his coins and inscriptions show that he was already reigning in 886 A.H. Some of the coins of 886 were struck at Fathabad (now Faridpur town) which was named after him.

Firāshṭah says that Fath Shah punished with the scourge of justice the eunuchs and Habshi slaves who had become powerful and violent. So they went to the chief eunuch called the Sultan Shāhzada Bangālī who was in charge of all the men who attended by turn (*مردم نویی*) and also had the keys of all the palaces. It so happened that the eunuch Khan Jahar the *ra* and Mahl. And the Habshi the *Amir ul umara* were engaged in punishing the Rays of the frontier with a picked body of the army so Sultan Shahāda could carry out his nefarious purpose with impunity.

The Cambridge History of India page 68 contrary to the Riyāz says that Fath Shah was a great uncle of Sikandar and a son of Mahmud which I suppose means Nasir ud din Mahmud Shah.

favours to everyone in accordance with his condition and rank. In his time the doors of pleasure and enjoyment remained open in the faces of the people.

As there was a custom in the country of Bangālah, that five thousand *pāiks* attended every night for watch and ward, and early in the morning, the *bādshāh* came out, and sat on the throne for a moment, and took their salute, and gave them permission to go away, when another body of *pāiks* came into attendance.

On one occasion, the chief eunuch of Fath Shāh tempted the *pāiks* with money and they slew the Sultān. Early the next morning the eunuch himself sat on the throne, and took the salute of the *pāiks*. This event occurred in the year 896 A H.

The period of the rule of Fath Shāh was seven years and five months.

They say that during some years, there was such a custom in Bangālah, that whoever slew a ruler, and sat on the throne, everyone became submissive and obedient to him.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF BĀRBĀK SHĀH

As the wretched Khwājah Sarāī after murdering his master took the title of *bādshāh*, all the eunuchs, wherever they were, collected

¹ The heading in the MSS. is as I have it in the text. The lith. ed. inserts the word *حکومت* before Bārbak Shāh.

The Riyāz (p. 121) agrees generally, but says the eunuch styled himself Sultān Shāhzāda. It goes on to say that he tried to destroy the powerful nobles. The most powerful of them, the Abyssinian Malik Andil, who was at the frontier wanted to come to the capital. Barbag also wanted to bring him there so that he might, by fraud and deceit, put him into prison. He therefore summoned him, and on Malik Andil's coming made him swear on the *Qorān* that he would not injure him in any way. Malik Andil took the oath, with the reservation that he would not do so as long as Bārbak was on the throne. He then schemed to avenge the murder of his benefactor. He got into the palace, and found the eunuch asleep on the throne. On account of his oath he was unable to kill him, but the eunuch who was drunk rolled down. Malik Andil drew his sword, but was unable to kill the eunuch. After this there was a Homeric struggle between the two in the dark. In the end Malik Andil got others to join in the attack and the eunuch was killed.

Malik Andil then summoned the *vazīrs* and a council was held to select a suitable person to succeed to the throne. Fath Shāh had left a son who was

together round him and he allured mean and low spirited men with wealth and ¹strengthening their allegiance with false promises assembled them round him. His pomp and strength increased day by day but in the end the great *amirs* who had many retainers joined together and on one occasion having united the *paiks* with themselves slew him.

The period of his reign was two and a ³ half months

⁴ AN ACCOUNT OF FIRUZ SHĀH

When the eunuch who had the title of Barbak Shah was killed the *amirs* and the well known men raised Firuz Shah to the chieftain

only two years of age and it was doubtful whether he should be placed on the throne. All the nobles then went to the widow of Fath Shh. She said she had made a vow that the throne should belong to the person who should slay her husband's murderer. Malik Andil at first declined to accept the crown but was finally persuaded to do so (pp 1 - 124)

Firishtah and Stewart and the Cambridge History of India follow the *Riyaz* generally but the Cambridge History of India (p 69) contrary to all the others calls Malik Andil Indil Khan. I do not know the authority for doing so. He was certainly not a Khan but was a Malik. As to Andil or Indil I know no Persian or Arabic word like either. There is a colloquial Bengali word *Andil* which means much but I do not know whether it has any connection with the name. In any case I prefer to follow the older historians instead of accepting the new spelling.

¹ One MS has منظر instead of نظر by mi take

There are differences in the reading. One MS and the lith ed have انفاق بمودة نوبنی گروه داکبرا. The lith ed however has by mi take the word کرده after گروه which I have struck out. The other MS has انفاق بمودة و موافقت کرده داکبرا. The latter reading appears to be somewhat better but as the other MS and the lith ed both give the other I have adopted it with the slight correction I have mentioned. M Hidayat Hosain has followed the second MS in the text edition.

³ M Hidayat Hosain has دو ماه و نیم روز or two months and half a day as the period of his reign in the text edition.

⁴ The heading in the MSS is as I have it in the text. The lith ed inserts the word *sulṭanat* before the name Firuz Shh.

The *Ṭabaqat* does not say that it was Malik Andil who assumed the title of Firuz Shah.

It appears from the *Riyaz* (p 190) that he took up his residence in Gaur where he erected a mosque a tower and a reservoir. He had done great deed

ship He was a merciful and benevolent king When the number of the days of his life were folded up (i.e., finished), he passed away by natural death in the year 899 A H But another statement is that the *pāik* watchmen killed him

The period of his rule was three years

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

When Firūz Shāh passed away, the *amīrs* and the great men placed his son on the throne of the empire, giving him the title of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh He was a *bādshāh* endowed with the moral qualities of the great

as a general and an administrator, and he was respected and feared when he ascended the throne He was a just and efficient ruler, but his great fault was his prodigality, and he lavished the treasures accumulated by the former Sultāns on beggars and mendicants As to his death, the Riyāz (p 125) says that the statement that he was killed by the *pāiks* appears to be more correct than that he died a natural death His full name appears from his coins to have been Saifu d dīn Abul Muzaffar Firuz Shāh His coins show that he reigned from 893 A H, to 895 A H, and not during the three years ending in 897 A H, as stated in the histories (p 124)

Firishtah and Stewart mention no new facts about him According to the Cambridge History of India, page 696, he reigned from 891 to 894 A H

¹ The heading in the MSS is as I have it in the text In the lith ed it is
 ذکر محمود شاه بن فیروز شاه

The full name of Sultān Mahmūd appears to have been Nāsir ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Mahmūd Shāh According to the Riyāz (p 126) he was only a Sultān in name During the early months of his brief reign, an Abyssinian of the name of Habsh Khān usurped all the authority The Sīdī Badī Dīwāna, another Abyssinian, slew Habsh Khān, and became the *de facto* ruler After some time, he got the *sardārs* of the *pāiks* to join him, and one night slew Mahmūd Shāh, and with the concurrence of the *amīrs* and the officers of the court, proclaimed himself Sultān under the title of Muzaffar Shāh

The Riyāz (p 126) also says, that according to the history of Hajī Muhammad Qandahari, Mahmūd Shāh was the son of Fath Shāh, and not of Malik Andil or Firūz Shāh He had been brought up by Jashn Khān, a slave of Bārbag Shāh, under the orders of Firuz Shāh, and after the latter's death was placed on the throne The name Jashn Khān appears to be a copyist's mistake for Habsh Khān

Firishtah agrees generally with the Riyāz He gives the name of the slave who brought Sultān Mahmūd up as Habsh Khān and not Jashn Khān

A slave of the name of Saiyidi Muzaffar Habshi having got the *sardars* and the *paiks* to combine with him made Mahmud Shah a martyr one night and early the next morning ascended the throne of the empire giving himself the title of Muzaffar Shah

The period of the reign of Mahmud Shah was one year

1 AN ACCOUNT OF MUZAFFAR SHAH HABSHI

When Muzaffar Shah Habshi took the place of the great by force and violence darkness spread over the world He was an audacious

1 I have adopted the reading in the lith ed Those in the MSS are very imperfect One has only Muzaffar Sh h and the other has دکتر مظفر حسنی His name according to his inscription and coins was Ala u d din Abul Muzaffar Sh h (Salam s translation of Riy p 128 note) From his coin it appears that he reigned from 896 A H i from 1491 to 1494 A H

According to the Riy iz (p 124) Muzaffar ascended the throne at Gaur He was extremely audacious and blood thirsty and put many learned and pious men and nobles and the Rajahs to death He appointed Syed Husain a Sharif of Mecca (who is called one of Muzaffar s *asipat* in the Tabaq t) to be his minister and made over to him all powers Afterward he added avarice to his other iniquities and according to the advice of Syed Husain he reduced the wages of his cavalry and infantry men and also collected the revenue with great harshness Then the great *amirs* rebelled against him and he shut himself up in the fort of Gaur The siege lasted for four months and Muzaffar died and to have slain four thousand men who had been seized and brought to him from time to time with his own hand Then he came out of the fort and a drawn battle took place between his men and the *amirs* now led by Syed Husain The latter were victorious and Muzaffar was slain It is also stated that according to Haji Muhammad Qandahari one hundred and twenty thousand men Musalman and Hindus were slain during this civil war The Riy z (p 128) then quotes from Tabaqat what is stated in the latter about the manner in which Muzaffar was slain

Firishtah and Stewart give no further information The Cambridge History of India page 70 calls the minister who according to the Riy z was called Syed Husain Sharif Makki Saiyid Ala u d din Husain who belonged to a family which came from Tarmuz on the Oxus and it also states that this man probably retrained Muzaffar s violence while according to the Riy and Firishtah the reduction in the pay of the soldiers which was one of the cause of the rebellion took place at his instance It appears from what is stated in the account of the reign of Sultan Ala u d din in the Riy that the name of Sultan Ala u d din before his accession was Syed Husain Sharif Makki that his father Syed Asrafal Husaini was probably Sherif of Mecca but the family

and blood-thirsty man. He raised many learned and pious men to the rank of martyrdom. In the end one of his soldiers, of the name of 'Alā-ud-dīn, having made the *sardārs* and the *paiks* friendly and in league with him, entered the seraglio one night with thirteen *paiks*, and slew him. Early the next morning, he sat on the throne and gave himself the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn.

The period of the reign of Muzaffar Shāh Habshī was three years and five months.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN 'ALĀ-UD-DĪN

Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn ² was an intelligent and able man and was a soldier. He showed favour to the *amīns* of old lineage, and he also

came from Tarmūz or Tarmāy in Tukestān. Sayyid Husain and his brother Sayyid Yūsuf came with their father to Bengal, and settled in Chandpur in Radha, of western Bengal. According to Blochmann, however, this Chāndpūr was really situated near 'Alāipūr in the present district of Khūlna. It appears also that although Sayyid Husain adopted the title of 'Alāuddīn Abul Muzaffar Husain Shāh, he was universally known as Husain Shāh, and that name is found on various inscriptions on the edifices in Gaūr, and according to Blochmann (*J A S B* for 1873, page 291) "the name of 'Husain Shāh the good' is still remembered from the frontiers of Orissa to the Brahmaputra." The statement in the Cambridge History of India (p. 270) about the original name of 'Alā ud dīn Husain Shāh being Sayyid 'Alā ud-dīn Husain appears to be incorrect.

¹ The heading in one MS. and the lith. ed. is *دکړ سامان علا الدین*, in the other it is only *سلمان علا الدین*, I have retained the former.

² The lith. ed. has the word *چون* before Sultan 'Alā ud dīn, but as both MSS. omit it, I have also omitted it. The account of his reign in the *Tabaqāt* is very imperfect. According to the *Riyāz* (pp. 129-136), although he became a good and great Sultān, his conduct does not appear to have been quite straightforward before his accession. Although he was in the service of Sultān Muzaffar he always spoke to everyone of the latter's meanness and avarice. In this way his own virtues and the vices of his master became known to everybody, so when Muzaffar was killed, the chiefs and the people readily consented to his becoming his successor. Then the way in which he rewarded the people, who raised him to the throne, was extremely objectionable. He allowed them to plunder and ravage the city of Gaur. Some days after his accession, he ordered the men to cease plundering, and when they did not do so, he had twelve thousand of them put to death. As a result of searching the houses of the wealthy he collected much wealth including thirteen hundred golden dishes.

raised his own special servants to high ranks and eminent positions. He removed the *paiks* from the duty of watch and ward so that no injury might be caused to him by them. He summoned learned great and pious men from different parts of the kingdom and showed kindness to them. He made very great efforts and exertions for enriching and improving the condition of the country and he allotted many villages for defraying the expenses of the alms houses attached to the tomb of that leader of the wayfarers (in the path of the law) Shaikh Nur Quṭb Ālam may his soul be sanctified¹. He came every year from Ekdala which was the seat of his government to Pandūah with the object of circumambulating the tomb which was the recipient of illumination of Shaikh Nur.

Owing to the auspiciousness of his laudable morals and pleasing virtues he performed the duties of sovereignty for long years and all his life was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. And in the end in the year 929 A H he passed away by death from natural causes. The period of his reign was twenty seven years and some months.

His evil deeds ceased after this. He removed the *paiks* from the work of watch and ward and banished all the Habshi and he employed Syeds Mughals and Afghans in position of trust. He subjugated the Rajas of the country and having conquered as far as Orissa levied tribute from the rulers of that country. He then invaded Assam and conquered that country as far as Kamrup and Kamtah (Haimaksha (?)). He left his son there with a large army and returned to Bengal. Afterwards when the rains commenced the Rajas who had fled to the mountains returned and his army was defeated and his son was slain.

The Riyāz then mentions his charities and his religious endowments.

In the year 900 A H Sultān Huṣayn Sharqi on being defeated by Silandar Lodi took refuge in Kahlgaon (Colgong) where he was received with honour and where he passed his remaining years.

Sultān Alauddin died of natural causes in 977 A H. The period of his reign was according to different authorities twenty seven years twenty four years and twenty nine years and five months. He had fourteen sons and one of them Naṣrat Shāh succeeded him.

Firishtah does not mention any fresh fact. Stewart (p. 110) says that Ala Addeen Hussein Shah came from the sandy deserts of Arabia to the fertile region of Bengal.

The Cambridge History of India also adds nothing to what is stated in the Riyāz. According to it his reign lasted for twenty five years (p. 7). The words *و ساقی* and a soldier are omitted in the text edition.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF NASĪB SHĀH

When Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn passed away, the *amīns* and the great men of the time raised ² Nasīb Shāh from amongst his eighteen sons to the chieftainship (i.e., to be the Sultān) ³ He, trusting his brothers, conferred on each one of them, double of what their father had bestowed on them

And when, in the year 932 A.H., His Majesty Firdūs Makānī Zahir-ud-dīn Muhammad Bābar *Bādshāh*, having slain Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūdī, took possession of the country of Dehlī, the *amīns* and the heads of ⁴ the various groups of Afghāns fled and came as suppliants to ⁵ Nasīb Shāh After some days, Sultān Mahmūd, brother of Sultān Ibrāhīm also came to him, ⁶ as a suppliant Nasīb Shāh bestowed on all of them *jāgīrs*, as far as possible and depending on the exigencies of the time ⁷ He also prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sultān Ibrāhīm for himself

In ⁸ the year 939 A.H. he sent by the hand of the eunuch Malīk Marjān to Sultān Bahādur Gujrātī, fine and beautiful presents, in

¹ The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS The lith. ed. has *دکتر سلطنت نصیب شاہ*, an account of the reign of Nasīb Shāh Both headings are incorrect It appears that the correct name of the eldest son of 'Alā-ud-dīn Husayn Shah was Nasīb Khān, and he assumed the title of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn Abul Muzaffar Nasrat Shāh The Rīyāz, however, says that his name or title was Nasrat Shāh, and he was commonly known as Nasīb Shāh

² The name is Nāsir Shāh in one MS and in the lith. ed. and Nasīb Shāh in the other MS I have adopted Nasīb Shāh

³ This was quite unusual for the age The Rīyāz (text, p. 136) says *نسیب شاهی که این بود که برادران را بخش و فید داد* - مناسب هر یکی *را* Other historians have also mentioned this generous action

⁴ The readings in the MSS are *وسران گروہ افغان* and *وسران گروہ* - *و افغان* The lith. ed. has *وسران گروہ افغانان*, which appears to me to be better than the other readings, and I have retained it

⁵ Here both the MSS have *نصیب شاہ* Nasīb Shāh

⁶ One MS and the lith. ed. have *باو ملکی شد*, but the other MS has *باو ملحق*

⁷ As was usual under the circumstances he married her

⁸ The reason of this embassy to Sultān Bahādur Shāh of Gujrāt which was sent in 939 A.H., is said in the Rīyāz (pp. 137, 138) to have been a report that Humāyūn after his accession intended to conquer Bengal

order to secure relation attachment and friendship Malik Marjan waited on Sultan Bahadur in the fort of Mandu and was honoured by the gift of a special robe of honour. No account of the Bengalis has after this come under my eyes. Nasib Shah ruled for a period of eleven years. After him Bangalah came within a short time into the possession of Sher Khan. When His Majesty Jinnat Ashiani came into Bangalah in pursuit of Sher Khan Jahangir Quli Beg ruled (the country) on behalf of him. Afterwards Sher Khan slew Jahangir Quli Beg and took possession of the country as has been mentioned in its place. Then Muhammad Khan, one of the *amirs* of Salim Khan, son of Sher Khan, governed the country for a time. After him his son gave himself the title of Sultan Bahadur and raised the standard of rule. The government of Bangalah and Behar was then held by Sulaiman Kararani, one of the *amirs* of Salim Khan. He ruled independently for a period of nine years and also took possession of the

¹ Nizam ud din gives no account of the death of Nasib Shah. It appears from the Riyaz and other histories that contrary to the mildness which he had shown in the beginning of his reign he now indulged in evil deeds and committed acts of oppression so the eunuchs, one of whom he had threatened with punishment, combined together and killed him in the year 943 A.H. The period of his reign is variously given. The Riyaz (p. 138) says that he reigned for sixteen years but according to some thirteen years or less than that. Firistah gives him sixteen years from 927 to 943 A.H. Col Briggs (vol. IV, pp. 350-352) says he reigned from 930 A.H. 153 A.D. to 945 A.H. 1538 A.D. i.e. for about fifteen years but he says also that he had a reign of eighteen years. According to Stewart (pp. 114-117) he reigned for thirteen years 1521 A.D. to 1533-34 A.D. Lane Poole (p. 308) gives him fourteen years from 930 A.H. 1518 A.D. to 939 A.H. 153 A.D. and the Cambridge History of India (p. 696) fifteen years from 1518 to 1533 A.D.

There are differences as to the period of Sulaiman Kararani's rule. One MS. has seven years the other has the word *sal* year without any number. The lith. ed. has one year. There is much diversity also in the other histories as to the period of his rule. The Riyaz (p. 153) says he ruled independently for sixteen years and died in 981 A.H. Firistah says he had the *Khutba* read in his own name but called himself *Hadrat Ala* and sent presents to Akbar from time to time and after reigning for about twenty-five years died in 981 A.H. Stewart (pp. 149-150) says he reigned from 977 when he came from Belar to Bengal till his death in 981 A.H. affecting to hold his kingdom under Akbar. In the Cambridge History of India the name of Sulaiman does not appear in the Index at all but in the list of the Kings of Bengal on page 696 he is shown as having reigned in 980 A.H. for some months only.

country of Orissa. Although he had not had the *Khutba* read in his own name, still he assumed the title of *Hadrat Ālā*. When he died, his son ¹ succeeded him, but his rule did not extend beyond thirteen days. He was killed by the efforts (machinations) of his own relations. The government was then allotted to his brother Dāūd. He made dying struggles for a period of two years, till he was defeated in the year 982 A H by Khān Khānān, who was the commander-in-chief of the army of His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, and the country of Bangālāh was conquered. Afterwards in the year 984 A H, he was slain by Khān Jahān, who after Khān Khānān had been honoured with the government of Bangālāh, as has been narrated in its own place. And up to this day, which is the year 1002 *Hijrī*, the country of Bangālāh and Ekdālā are in the possession of the servants of the powerful empire.

SECTION VII THE SECTION ABOUT THE SHARQĪ SULTĀNS

The Sharqī Sultāns ² ruled in the country of Jaunpūr and the neighbouring tracts from ³the beginning of the year 784 A H to

¹ His name is Bāyazīd

² One MS. and the lith. ed. have *کردند*, but the other MS. has *کرده اند*

³ The lith. ed. is very incorrect. The MSS. agree, but whereas the total period is said to be 97 years, the total of the different reigns come to over one hundred and twelve years. I have compared the list with those given by Lane-Poole, page 309, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 701. It was somewhat difficult to find the latter list, for in the Index page 701, it is not mentioned either against Jaunpur or against the Sharqī dynasty. Comparing these lists with that in the text, I find that the names agree, except that the fifth name is Mahmūd Shāh in the list in the text while it is Muhammad Shāh in the other list, but the periods differ. No. 1, has sixteen years in the *Tabaqāt* but only 6 in the other lists. The difference in the case of No. 2 is negligible. Ibrāhīm, No. 3, who has forty years in the *Tabaqāt* has forty-one years according to the A H chronology and forty years according to the A D chronology in Lane Poole, while the Cambridge History of India gives him only 36 A H or 34 A D years. No. 4 who has twenty one years in the *Tabaqāt*, has 17 A H years or 16 A D years according to Lane-Poole, and 22 years both A H and A D according to the Cambridge History of India. No. 5, who has 5 years according to the *Tabaqāt* has 2 years according to the Lane Poole and less than

the year 881 A H which was a period of ninety seven years (The rulers were) —

Sultān ush sharq K̲h̲wajah Jahan sixteen years

Mubārak Shah Sharqī one year and some months

Sultān Ibrahim Sharqī forty years and some months

Sultān Mahmud son of Ibrahim twenty one years and some months

Sultān Mahmud son of Sultān Mahmud five years

Sultān Husain son of Mahmud nineteen years

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN USH SHARQ

It is traditionally recorded that when the turn of the reign of Sultān Mahmud son of Sultān Muhammad son of Firuz Shah came he sent the eunuch Malik Sarwar on whom Sultān Muhammad Shah had conferred the title of K̲h̲wajah Jahan to the country of Jaunpur after bestowing on him the title of Sultān ush sharq and conferred the government of that country on him. When Sultān Mahmud lost his (power and) grandeur Sultān ush sharq became completely independent and having punished the insurgents of *parganas* Kol and Itawah ² Kampilah and Bahraich brought all the territory from the

1 year according to the Cambridge History of India No 6 has 19 years according to the Tabaqat but 18 years according to Lane Poole from 863 to 881 A H when he fled to Bengal and 2 A H years or 21 A D years according to the Cambridge History of India. It appears to me that it is impossible to have a correct list of the periods of the different reigns.

¹ The heading in the MS is as I have it in the text. In the lith ed the word سلطان is inserted before السلطنة.

Firishtah says that the Sultān ush sharq was sent to Jaunpur and Behar and Tirhut in Jamādī ul awwal 6 A H and he died in 809 A H and the period of his rule was six years. According to Col Briggs (vol IV p 359) he was sent in 796 A H which reconciles the discrepancy. The dates in Col Briggs's history agree with those given by Lane Poole and the Cambridge History of India.

One MS has Muhammad which is correct. The other omits the word son of Sultān Muhammad while the lith ed has Mahmud instead of Muhammad.

² Written as كنبلة and كندبلة in the MSS and كنبلة in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has Kol Itawah Bharach and Kampilah (كنبلة) all in the *Doc b*

direction of Dehlī, as far as *parganas* Kōl and Rāpī, and in the other direction as far as Behāi and Tūhūt under his government. The country again attained a new grandeur. He again obtained elephants and other tributes which used to come every year from the country of Lakhnautī, but which had not come for some years owing to the weakness of the rulers (of Dehlī). His greatness and grandeur made such an impression on the minds of the *zamīndārs* (Hindu chieftains), that they without any demand used every year to send the tribute that had been fixed.

In the year 802 A H, the marauding ¹ Turk of death robbed the capital of the life of the Sultān-ush-sharq.

The period of his rule was sixteen years.

² AN ACCOUNT OF MUBĀRAK SHĀH SHARQĪ

When Sultān-ush-sharq died, and about the time when the affairs of the government of Dehlī became more and more disordered, and the administration became disorganised, Malik Mubārak Qarnful, who was the adopted son of Sultān-ush-sharq, in concert with the *amīns* and *sardārs* gave himself the title of Mubārak Shāh, and raised the standard of government. The *Khūtba* was read in his name in the country of Jaunpūr and in the other countries, which had been in the possession of Sultān-ush-sharq.

When the news that Sultān-ush-sharq had died, and Malik Mubārak Qarnful had assumed the title of Mubārak Shāh, reached Mallū Iqbāl Khān, he in the year ³ 803 A H, collected a large army, and advanced towards Jaunpūr. On the way, he chastised the insur-

¹ One MS omits the word نرک

² The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith. ed. inserts the word مبارک شاه شرفی before سلطنت

³ The year is 803 A H, ثلث و رباعه, in one MS. In the other it is 803-4 اربع و ثلث و رباعه which is absurd in meaning. The lith. ed. has 804 A H اربع و رباعه. The reading in the first MS is correct. Firishtah has that year, further, the year 804 A H was crowded with too many events. An account of these events has been given on pages 283, 284 of vol. I of the translation of this work. Neither Firishtah nor the Cambridge History of India gives any additional facts.

gents of Itawāh and arrived at Kanauj. Mubarak Shah also ¹ collected an army and came forward to oppose him. As the river Ganges flowed between the two armies they remained camped opposite each other for two months and neither had the courage and boldness to place their foot on the field of bravery and to cross the river. They retired each to their own country without risking a battle. After Mubarak Shah had arrived at Jaunpur news reached him that Sultān Mahmud had returned to Dehli from Gujrat and Mallu Iqbal Khān was again advancing towards Kanauj taking Sultān Mahmud with him. Immediately on hearing this news he began to collect his army but death did not give him time and in the year 804 A.H. he accepted the summons of the just God.

The period of his rule was one year and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN IBRĀHIM SHARQI

After the death of Mubarak Shah the *amirs* of the Sharqi dominions placed his younger brother to whom they gave the title of Sultan Ibrahim on the seat of the government and the throne of the empire. All classes of men had rest in his time in the cradle of peace and safety. The ³ learned and the great who were in distress of mind from the disturbances in the world turned their faces to Jaunpur which became at that time the seat of peace and that metropolis (that is Jaunpur) became from the splendour of their advent the city of learning. Some books and treatises such as the ⁴ Hashiah

¹ The words are جمع بمودة in one MS. and in the lith. ed. and incorrectly بمودة ~ in the other MS.

One MS. and the lith. ed. have اورنگ حکومت the other MS. has ارانگ حکومت. I have followed the reading in the first manuscript.

³ Firishtah amplifies and explains this by saying فصلاحي ممالک هندوستان و دا : e the learned men of the country of India and the wise men of Persia and Turkistan.

⁴ Firīhtah gives some account of these books. They appear to have been all written by Qādi Shihab ud dīn Jaunpuri whose native place was Chānn and who had received his education in Daulatabad in the Deccan. Firishtah says that Sultān Ibrahim Sharqi held him with such honour that once when he was seriously ill the Sultān went to make enquiries and after making them fill a cup with water and passing it round the head of the sick man drank

ī-Hindī", 'the¹ Bahī-ul-Mawāj", the "Fatāwī-ī-Ibrāhīm Shāhī", the "Irshād" and others (were written in his name) As divine help was always attendant on that world-protecting *bādshāh*, he had necessarily in the beginning of his reign carried off the prize in the² field of spirituality from all the sovereigns of *Hindūstān*, in the matter of experience and knowledge of affairs

In the beginning of his reign he collected an army, and advanced to destroy Sultān Mahmūd and Mallū Iqbāl Khān, who had the thought of conquering Jaunpūr in their heads When the two armies encamped in front of each other, Sultān Mahmūd, on the ground that Mallū Iqbāl Khān did not permit him to interfere at all in the affairs of the empire, and did not place before him, for his decision, the facts and circumstances of any administrative problems, went out from his own camp on the pretext of going out to hunt, and joined Sultān Ibrāhīm³ The latter owing to haughtiness and pride did not perform the duty which he owed to his salt, and delayed and procrastinated in making enquiries (about his health, etc) Sultān Māhmūd feeling aggrieved betook himself to Kanauj, and removing the *thānadār* of the place, who had been there from before the time of Mubārak Shāh, and who was called⁴ *Amīrzādah'-ī-Haiwī* (*Amīrzāda* of Haiāt) took possession

it off, praying to God, that every danger that might happen to him may ward off him, and should fall on himself This was like Bābar's offering himself for the recovery of Humāyūn, but it was more beautiful, being quite disinterested The Qādi also loved the Sultān so dearly that he died the same year as the Sultān, though according to another account, he died two years later

¹ One of the MSS omits 15 or 16 lines from after the word *بحر المواجه* to the words *امرا را رحمت حاگیو نمود* They are, however, written further on

² The words actually used are *مصبار معالی* I cannot find any meaning of *مصبار* which would suit the context

³ Firishtah explains, that Sultān Mahmūd had expected that Sultān Ibrāhīm keeping before his eyes the rights and dues of hereditary salt and service, will either raise him to sovereignty, or giving him help, crush Iqbāl Khān, but as Ibrāhīm Sharqī had tasted the joys of sovereignty, and his rule had not yet become quite firm, neither of Sultān Mahmūd's hopes were realised For another version of these incidents, see page 284 of vol I of the translation

⁴ The word appears to be *میرزاده هروی* in the MSS The lith ed has *امیرزاده هروی* Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *امیرزاده هروی* I have adopted this.

of the place. On hearing this news Sultān Ibrahim and Mallu Iqbal Khan went respectively to Jūnpur and Dehli leaving Kanauj to Sultān Mahmud. It has however come to my notice in some histories that Sultan Mahmud actually went to Mubarak Shah Sharqi at this time the latter died and Sultān Ibrahim succeeded him. God only knows the truth¹.

In the year 807 A H Mallu Iqbal Khan again came to besiege Kanauj. Sultan Mahmud with a small number of his special retainers fortified himself and behaved with bravery. Mallu returned to Dehli disappointed and unsuccessful. And when in the following year he was slain by Khidr Khan in the neighbourhood of Ajodahan as has been already mentioned Sultān Mahmud came to Dehli leaving¹ Malik Mahmud at Kanauj and sat on the throne of his great ancestors. Sultān Ibrahim availing himself of this great opportunity determined to conquer Kanauj in the year 809 A H. Sultān Mahmud marched with the army of Dehli in order to engage him. The two armies encamped facing each other on the banks of the Ganges and after a few days went back without fighting to their own territories. When Sultān Mahmud arrived in Dehli and gave permission to the *amirs* to go back to their own *jagirs* Sultān Ibrahim came back again and laid siege to Kanauj. After the period of the siege had been protracted to four months and no help or reinforcements arrived from Dehli Malik Mahmud prayed for quarter and surrendered Kanauj. Sultān Ibrahim made over Kanauj to Ikhtiyar Khan and advanced to conquer Dehli. On the way Tatar Khan son of Sarang Khan and Malik Marjan slave of Mallu Iqbal Khan came from Dehli and joined him. Sultān Ibrahim gaining greater power and strength marched towards Sanbal and when he arrived there Asad Khan Ludi abandoned the place and fled. Sultān Ibrahim entrusted Sanbal

¹ Called Malik Mahmud Tarmatī on page 287 of vol I of the translation. He is also called *نرمی* in Firistat's account of Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi. It also appears from that account that Sultan Ibrahim Sharqi passed the rainy season at Kanauj and advanced towards Dehli in the month of Jamādī ul awwal 810 A H.

Called Malik Marhaba on page 288 of vol I of the translation.

to ¹Tātāi Khān, and continued his march towards Dehli. On the way he seized the town of Baran, and made it over to Malik Marjān.

When he arrived on the bank of the ²Jamunā, his scouts brought the news, that Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī had arrived in Mālwa, and was coming to aid and reinforce Sultān Mahmūd. Sultān Ibrāhīm surrendering the reins of bravery returned towards Jaunpūr. Sultān Mahmūd made over the government of Sanbal, in accordance with the ancient custom to Asad Khān Lūdī, and returned to Dehli.

In the ³year 831 A H, Sultān Ibrāhīm advanced to attack the fort of Biānah. At this time Khidī Khān ruled in Dehli. He advanced from there to meet and destroy Sultān Ibrāhīm. After the two armies had met, the battle raged from morning to evening, and much slaughter and bloodshed occurred. On the following day a ⁴peace was concluded, and Sultān Ibrāhīm returned to Jaunpūr and Khidī Khān to Dehli.

In the year 837 A H, Sultān Ibrāhīm was able to repair the damages and losses sustained by his army, and having set his mind at rest in respect of the insurgents in the various parts of his dominions, he determined to conquer Kālpi, and advanced with full force.

¹ It would appear that the rule of Tātār Khān and Malik Marjān or Malik Marhabā was of very brief duration. Sultān Mahmūd marched to Sanbal and Baran. Tātār Khān fled to Kanauj, and the other, who offered some resistance, was slain. See page 288 of vol. I of the translation.

² حوں in the text edition.

³ There is a long interval of about twenty years here. During this time, Sultān Ibrāhīm was engaged for some time in an invasion of Bengal, at the request of the holy Shaikh Qūtb-ul 'Ālām. He had to return from Bengal, as Rāja Ganēsh persuaded the Shaikh afterwards to ask him to do so, on his promising to become a convert to Muhammadanism. This invasion is not mentioned by either Nizām-ud dīn or Firishtah in their accounts of the reign of Sultān Ibrāhīm.

Firishtah, however, mentions a projected invasion of Dehli in 816 A H, from which, however, Sultān Ibrāhīm returned after some marches, and then according to Firishtah he occupied himself for some years in the society of Shaikhs and learned men, and in rebuilding and improving Jāunpūr and in increasing the cultivation of land all over the province, so that Jaunpūr was described by people as a second Dehli.

⁴ The words are گرجہ اشتی or کرک. I cannot find any meaning of کرک or گرج which would suit the context.

At this time news came that Sultan Husang Churi had also determined upon the conquest of Kalpi. When the two *badshahs* arrived near each other and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow the scouts brought the news that Mubarak Shah son of Khidr Khan had collected an immense army and intended to march from Dehli for the conquest of Jaunpur. Sultan Ibrahim having lost all control of himself retired towards Jaunpur. Sultan Husang took possession of Kalpi without any dispute and having had the *Ahulba* read in his own name returned to Mandu.

In the year 840 A.H. a disease attacked Sultan Ibrahim's person. Although physicians treated him no improvement resulted and in the end he accepted the summons of God.

The period of his rule was ¹forty years and some months and some days.

- AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN MAHMUD SON OF IBRAHIM SHARQI

When Sultan Ibrahim surrendered the deposit of life his eldest son Sultan Mahmud sat on the throne of Jaunpur and became the successor of his father. The gardens of the hopes of the people became refreshed and verdant with the abundance of the rain of his beneficence. The kingdom acquired a new grandeur and greatness and the people received happiness and joy. After regulating the affairs of the army and the kingdom and the punishment of the insurgents and the turbulent people he sent in the year 847 A.H. an eloquent ambassador with beautiful gifts and presents to Sultan Mahmud Khalji and with the message ² that Nasir Khan Jahan son of Qadir

¹ The readings are slightly different. One MS. has the reading I have adopted in the text. The other has *چهل سال و چند ماہ بود* without any verb while the lith. ed. has *چهل سال و چند روز بود*. This has been adopted by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text edition.

² The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. In the lith. ed. the word *saltanat* is inserted before and the word *Sharqi* after the word *Sultan Mahmud*.

³ He is so called in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firishlah, however omits the word *Jahan*. The Cambridge History of India (p. 2) says that Nasir and before him his father Qadir had taken advantage of the disputes regarding the succession to the throne of Malwa to declare their independence.

Khān, the ruler of Kālpī, had placed his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet, and was following the path of heterodoxy, that he had destroyed the town of Shāhpūr, which was larger and more populous than Kālpī, had banished Musalmāns from their homes, and had made over Musalmān women to *Kāfis*, and as from the time of Sultān Hūshang, of blessed memory, to the present day, the chain of attachment and the relations of affection had become strengthened between the two parties, it appeared obligatory on me under the behest of the *Qādī* 'Aqal (Reason), that I should reveal it to your justice-loving mind. If you permit it, I shall chastise him, and make the tenets and rites of the Muhammadan religion current in that country."

Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī wrote in reply, "These matters had come to my hearing in the shape of false rumours, but that now your honourable self, the leader of Sultāns, has notified them to me, they have reached the standard of definite knowledge, and under these circumstances, ¹ the destruction of that wicked person is incumbent on all *bādshāhs*. If my own forces were not engaged in chastising the rebels of Mēwāt, I would myself ² have advanced to destroy him. Now that that asylum of *saltanats* has formed this resolution, may it be of good omen!"

The ambassador came back to Jaunpūr, and narrated what had happened. Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī was pleased in his mind, and sent twenty-nine elephants to Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī, as a present

and to assume the title of Nasīr Shāh and Qādir Shāh. Nasīr Shāh appears to have adopted some heretical practices, but I think the Cambridge History of India is wrong in assuming that Sultān Mahmūd was entirely actuated by religious motives in his proceedings against him. It should be remembered that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī had attempted unsuccessfully to seize Kālpī, which had, however, been taken by Sultān Hūshang of Mālwa. Indeed a few lines later on, the Cambridge History of India (page 253) expresses a doubt as to whether Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī was impelled by ambition or by a just appreciation of the offences of which Nasīr had been guilty.

¹ One MS has by mistake دفع اول خاطر به بادشاهان instead of دفع ان فاجر به بادشاهان

² There are slight variations in the readings. The MSS have عارم میگردد and عارم میگردد, while the lith ed has عارم میگردد. I prefer عارم میگردد

He then collected his troops and advanced towards Kalpi. Nāsir Khan becoming acquainted with this submitted a report to Sultān Mahmud Khalji to the following purport: Sultān Hūshang Shah of blessed memory bestowed this country on me. Now Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī wishes to take possession of it with force and violence and the defence of this *faqir* is obligatory on the (noble) spirit of the Sultān.

Sultān Mahmud Khalji on becoming acquainted with the purport of this petition wrote a letter couched in terms of sincerity and affection and sent Ali Khan with it and with suitable presents to the Sharqī Sultān and mentioned in it that Nāsir Khan the ruler of Kalpi having the fear of God and that Lord of grandeur before his eyes has become repentant and has promised that having redressed and corrected what had happened he would not again place his foot outside the path of the law of the Prophet ¹ and in carrying out the behests of providence (*Ahkām Samūi*) would permit no hesitation or dilatoriness. As Sultān Hūshang who has received the mercy of God had bestowed that country on Qadir Khan his successors are enlisted in the band of those who are faithful and obedient to me. We should therefore pardoning his former transgressions forbear from further interference with his territory.

The reply to the letter and petition of Ali Khan (i.e. I suppose the letter of Sultān Mahmud Khalji sent by the hand of Ali Khan) had not yet arrived when another petition of Nāsir Khan came to the effect that: This *faqir* has borne the ring of sincere loyalty in his ear and the burden of obedience on his shoulder (these were ancient marks of slavery) since the time of Sultān Hūshang and now Sultān Mahmud Sharqī has on account of an old grudge and ancient enmity invaded Kalpi and seizing the country with pomp and power has turned the *faqir* out of his native territory and has imprisoned Musalmān women. And in spite of the fact that Sultān Mahmud Sharqī had obtained permission to chastise Nāsir Khan still when the latter had made humble and pitiful supplications (Sultān Mahmud

¹ The word is different in the MS. and in the lith. ed. One MS. has بعلد the other has what looks like بعلد. The lith. ed. has الفاء. Trishtah in the corresponding passage has بعلد.

Khaljī) advanced on the 2nd Sha‘bān of the year 840 A H towards Chandēri and Kālpī. At Chandēri Nasir Khān came and ¹waited on him. From Chandēri, the Sultān advanced towards ²Erij. Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, hearing this news, immediately started for Kālpī to meet him. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī sent a detachment to oppose the Jaunpūr army, and another detachment to plunder the rear-guard of that army. The latter went and slew the men, who had been left behind in the camp, and looted whatever they could lay their hands upon. The detachment, that had been sent to confront the Jaunpūr army, stretched its hands in conflict and battle, and brave and useful men were killed on both sides. In the end, the two armies retired to their respective camps. On the following morning, Sultān Mahmūd sent ‘Imād-ul-mulk to block the enemy’s road. The latter becoming aware of this intention remained where they were, which was a strong and rugged and difficult position.

Sultān Mahmūd, becoming aware of the strength of the ground sent a detachment to plunder the environs of Kālpī, and it returned after taking much booty. When the rainy season came, a sort of peace was patched up, and the parties retraced their steps. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī came to Chandēri, and Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, taking advantage of the opportunity, sent troops to raid the country of Barhār, the residents of which were obedient to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī. The latter sent a detachment, to help and reinforce the headman of the country of Barhār. As the detachment, which had been sent by Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, was not sufficiently strong to meet it, the latter himself came and joined it.

After a few days, Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-Islām, Shaikh Jāīaldah, who was one of the great and holy men of the age, and towards whom Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī had right relations of reverence and faith, and whose remains are now buried under the dome of the tomb of the Sultāns of Mālwa at Mandū, to the following purport, viz, “Musalmāns on both sides have been slain,

¹ Both MSS have ملاقات, but the lith ed has ملاصمت, which appears to me to be more appropriate, and I have retained it. M Hidayat Hosain has retained ملاقات in the text edition.

² M Hidayat Hosain has ایرجه in the text-edition.

¹ and it would be well if (your Holiness) would endeavour to effect concord and friendship (between the contending powers) The emissary of Sultan Mahmud Sharqi made this statement to Shaikh Jafaldah that his master would at once make over the town of Ratah to Nasir Khan and within four months after the return of Sultan Mahmud Khalji he would also make over to Nasir Khan the town of ³Irī and the whole of the country of Kalpi which had come into his possession

When Sultan Mahmud Sharqi's emissary submitted this proposal to Shaikh Jafaldah the latter sent him in the company of his own *Khadim* (servant or disciple) to Sultan Mahmud (Khalji) and also sent a letter containing much advice. Sultan Mahmud Khalji decided that no peace could take place unless Kalpi was immediately handed over. But Nasir Khan who had been driven out of his territory considered that the recovery of Ratah would be a great boon and submitted that as Sultan Mahmud Sharqi was making the promise in the presence of noble men and before Shaikh Jafaldah it was certain that there would be no deviation from it. When Sultan Mahmud Khalji saw that the man most interested in the matter was satisfied with this settlement he sent for Sultan Mahmud Sharqi's emissary into his presence and accepted his proposals on the condition that after that date Sultan Mahmud Sharqi would not in any way interfere

¹ There are slight differences in the readings. One MS has *اگر صلاح داب* after which some words are evidently left out. The lith. ed has *اگر در صلاح داب* after *النس سعی*. The other MS has *اگر صلاح داب* after *النس سعی*. The lith. ed has *اگر در صلاح داب* after *النس سعی*. The meaning is not quite clear but I think the translation conveys the intended idea.

There are differences in readings here also. One MS has *قصه ارج و* *سائر بلاد کالی*. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MSS have *قصه ارج و* *سائر بلاد کالی*. The lith. ed has *قصه ارج و* *سائر بلاد کالی*. The corresponding line in the lith. ed of Firishah appears to be different and incorrect. It is *بالعمل قصه ارج و کالی که به تصرف سلطان*. *سرمی درآمده ابرا به به تصرف حال حراغده گداس*

³ The name is transliterated as Irī in the Cambridge History of India (p. 53) but later on (pp. 355 and 364) it is printed as Irī

with the descendants of Qādir Shāh, and more specially with Nasīr Khān Jahān, and for the last time the footsteps of his soldiers should not reach this country, and after four months, he should make over Kālpi and the other towns to Nasīr Khān Jahān. When the foundations of the peace became strengthened by the physical and spiritual attention of Shaikh Jāīaldah, Sultān Mahmūd Khālji granted permission to the emissary of Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī after bestowing rewards and favours on him to retire, and he himself cast the shadow of his favour on the residents of his capital of Mandū.

And Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī also returned to Jaunpūr, and on his arrival there, bringing out the hand of lavishness and benevolence from the sleeve of generosity and liberality made all sections of the people, according to the difference of their ranks, fortunate and happy.

¹ And when he had rested for some time at Jaunpūr, and his army had repaired the damages and losses which it had sustained he advanced towards the country of ² Chunār, and having plundered and devastated that country, made all the refractory people of that neighbourhood, food for the sword. He took possession of some *paraganas* and towns, and left *thānadārs* there, and having made the necessary arrangements returned to Jaunpūr.

After some days he advanced into the country of Orissa with the object of *Jihād* (war of religion) and the intention of becoming a Ghāzī, and having plundered and devastated that country, and pulled down and destroyed idol temples, returned with triumph and victory, and in the year 862 A H, (1458 A D), he was united with the divine mercy.

The period of his reign was ³ twenty-one years and some months.

¹ Nizām ud dīn does not mention here that Mahmūd Shāh Sharqī had two conflicts with Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī, first attack on Dehli in 856 A H, 1452 A D, and second, an advance on Itāwah in 1457 A D, for some account of which see pages 340–342 of vol. I of the translation.

² It is چنار in the text-edition.

³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have twenty-one years and some months, as I have it in the text. The other MS. has twenty years and some months.

AN ACCOUNT OF ¹ SULTĀN MAHMŪD SHĀH SON OF MAHMUD SHĀH

When Sultān Mahmud Sharqī passed away from amongst (men) the *amirs* and the pillars of the state raised Shahzada Bhikūn K̲han who was his eldest son on the throne of the empire and gave him the title of Sultān Mahmud Shah. As he was unfit for the duties of a ruler he perpetrated deeds which were improper for him. The *amirs* and the chief men of the country excused him from carrying on the government and raised his brother Husain K̲han to the position of power.

The time of his (i.e. Sultān Mahmud Shah's) rule was about five months.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN HUSAIN SON OF MAHMŪD SHĀH

As they excused Mahmud Shah his brother from the duties of government they raised him to the seat of power and made a proclamation of justice and equity. All the *amirs* and great men submitted to him and obeyed him. As the *huma* (a fabulous bird) of his noble spirit had the ambition of conquering various countries in its head he collected three hundred thousand horsemen and fourteen hundred elephants and ³ advanced towards the country of Orissa. In the course of the march he subjected the country of Tirhut to various calamities and levied tribute from the refractory people ⁴ of that

¹ One MS leaves out the word Sultan before Mahmud Shah. He is called Mahmud Shah in both MSS and in the lith ed. His correct title was Sultan Muhammad Shah according to Firishtah and according to the Cambridge History of India. The account of his five months' rule as given here is very vague and hazy. For a fuller and more vivid account see under Bahlul Lodi pages 343-45 of vol. I of the translation.

The word *سب* is in the MS and in the lith ed. I have changed it to *بود* was.

³ The account of the invasion of Orissa and of the devastation of Tirhut on the ravages given by Firishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 50) agrees mainly with that in the text. The numbers of horsemen and elephants in Sultan Husain's army appear to be exaggerated.

⁴ There are differences in the readings. One MS has *منورده منورداں* *گروہ* which is incorrect and meaningless. The other has *ارمنورداں ان ناحس حراج گروہ*. This is better but *ناحس* should be changed to *ناحب* and *گروہ* to *گروہ*. The lith ed has *ارمنورداں اندبار ناحب حراج*.

country and its environs When he arrived in the country of Orissa, he sent detachments for plundering and ravaging the various parts of the country The Rāy of Orissa, in great distress and helplessness, made his submission, and sending an agent to wait on the Sultān prayed for the pardon of his faults and offences, and sent thirty elephants and one hundred horses and much stuffs and other goods in the way of tribute Sultān Husam returned from that country to Jaunpūr crowned with victory and triumph

¹ In the year 870 A H, he put the fort of Benāres, which had become dilapidated in the course of time, into repairs, and in the following year (871 A H, 1466 A D) he sent some of his *amāns* to capture the fort of Gwāliar When the siege was much prolonged, the Rāy of Gwāliar paid tribute, and became enlisted in the band of his tributaries

In the year 878 A H, 1473 A D, he, at the instigation of his wife *Malkah-i-Jahān*, who was the daughter of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, son of Muhammad Shāh, son of Farid Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Khidr Khān, raised the standard of departure with one hundred and forty thousand horsemen for a war with Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī and for the conquest of Dehlī ² Sultān Bahlūl sent an emissary to wait on Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, and sent him a message to the effect, that if he should advance to support and aid him, the country as far as the fort of Biānah should belong to him A reply had not yet come from Mandū, when Sultān Husam seized a large part of the territory appertaining

گرفت This is the best reading, but requires the conjunction, و between لادت and انداز I have accepted this reading and inserted the conjunction M Hidayat Hosain has لادت instead of لادت in the text-edition

¹ Firishtah gives 871 A H as the year in which the fort of Benāres was repaired and the army was sent to capture Gwāliar Col Briggs (vol IV, p 376) does not mention the repairs to the fort of Benāres, and gives 870 A H, 1465 A D, as the year of the invasion of Gualiar The Cambridge History of India also does not mention the repairs of the fort of Benāres, and places the invasion of Gwalior in the year 1466 A D (p 255)

² The Cambridge History of India does not mention this appeal to Sultān Mahmūd Khālji for help, but Firishtah does The Cambridge History of India (p 256), says that Bahlūl was obliged to make this humiliating proposal, as he could not get more than eighteen thousand horsemen to meet Sultān Husam's large army It also appears from what follows, that he came out of Dehlī to meet the enemy with only that small number of horsemen

to Dehli Sultan Bahlul making humility and a piteous appeal the means of his safety sent a message to Sultan Husam that the country of Dehli would belong to the servants of the Sultan if he would leave the country round Dehli for a distance of eighteen *karohs* in his possession and he should be enlisted in the bands of the Sultan's servants and would remain in the post of the *darogha* of Dehli on behalf of the latter. Sultan Husam on account of his great pride and haughtiness did not listen to these proposals with the intention of consent and acceptance. In the end Sultan Bahlul relying on divine aid and assistance came out of Dehli with eighteen thousand horsemen and encamped in front of Sultan Husam's army. As the river ¹ Jamuna lay between the two armies neither advanced to give battle. It so happened however that one day Sultan ² Husam's soldiers had gone on a marauding excursion and except for the commanders no one was left in the camp. Sultan Bahlul's soldiers taking advantage of such an opportunity plunged their horses into the river ³ at the time of midday. Although this news was taken to Sultan Husam he did not owing to his haughtiness and pride believe it until Sultan Bahlul's men stretched their hands to plunder the camp and seized its outskirts. In this way Sultan Husam was defeated without a battle and *Malkah-i-Jahan* and all the inmates of the harem were seized. Sultan Bahlul having regard for the rights of the salt he had eaten endeavoured to show all respect and honour to *Malkah-i-Jahan* and having made necessary preparations sent her to Sultan Husam.

When *Malkah-i-Jahan* joined the Sultan she again ⁴ got into his kernel and skin and again commenced to incite him and in the

¹ آب حوں in the text edition

Firishtah's statement is just the opposite. He says سرداران بزرگ حسن. The Cambridge History of India (p. 256) says Husam Shah was accustomed to permit nearly the whole of his army to disperse for the purpose of plundering the rich villages of the Doab.

³ The words are روت اسدوا. I cannot find any meaning of اسدوا which quite suits the context. Firishtah says در این موسم تابان بود in the very midst of the hot season at a place where there it could be forded.

⁴ Firishtah uses the same words. I do not know their exact meaning but I suppose it is either acquired great influence over him or worried him by constant iteration.

following year induced him again to collect and equip his army to fight with Sultān Bahlūl. When there was only a short distance between the two armies, Sultān Bahlūl sent an emissary with the following message, "Would the Sultān be pleased to pardon my offences and leave me in my present condition, for I shall one day be of use to him."

As ¹ the pen of fate had so decreed, that greatness should pass away from the dynasty of the Sharqī Sultāns, Sultān Husam did not at all listen to his words. After the forces had been arrayed, defeat again fell on the Jaunpūr army. In the same way, on a second occasion, he came with a well-equipped army, but had to take to flight. On the ² fourth occasion things became so difficult for Sultān Husam, that he had to throw himself off his horse and run away. ³ These facts have been narrated with full particulars and details, in the section about the Sultāns of Dehlī.

On the ⁴ fourth occasion, Sultān Bahlūl took Jaunpūr into his own possession, and established his son Bārbak Shāh there. Sultān Husam had to content himself with a section of his territory, the revenues of which amounted only to five *kīors*, and to pass his time there. Sultān Bahlūl, acting in a spirit of generosity, did not interfere with him.

When Sultān Bahlūl accepted the summons of the just God, and the office of the Sultān was allotted to his son Sultān Sikandar, Sultān Husam induced Bārbak Shāh to advance on Dehlī and seize his father's kingdom for himself. With this intention Bārbak Shāh advanced from Jaunpūr towards Dehlī. Then a battle took place, and Bārbak Shāh fled back to Jaunpūr. He again equipped an army, and advanced

¹ There are differences in the readings. One MS has *چون فلم تقدیر نویں* 'دو رفتہ بود'. This appears to be correct and I have adopted it. The other MS has *چون بعددیر کہ دولت*, leaving out the words *فلم* and *دو رفتہ بود*. The lith ed has *چون تقدیر نویں رفتہ بود*, the word *تقدیر* being used by mistake for *تقدیر*.

² The third occasion is not mentioned, or the fourth occasion in the text here is a mistake for the third.

³ See page 348 and the following pages of vol. I of the translation.

⁴ It is *چهارم مرتبہ* in both MSS, and in the lith ed and in *Firishtah*, but a fourth occasion has already been mentioned in the previous paragraph.

to Dehli. When he fled a second time Sulṭān Sikandar pursued him and took Jaunpur out of his possession. As Sulṭān Husam was the cause of all the confusion and disturbance Sulṭān Sikandar went and attacked him and after some fighting seized the territory which was in his possession. Sulṭān Husam then fled and found an asylum with the ruler of Bangalāh. The term of his reign was 19 years. After his defeat he was for some years confined in the bounds of borrowed life (which is a very figurative way of saying that he lived for some years). After that the Sharqī Empire came to an end. Six persons ruled for a period of 97 years and some months.

¹ One MS. has by mistake مرعوم for مرعور and the other has مسعاد for

TABAQĀT-I-AKBARĪ

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

(VOLUME III—*contd*)

SECTION VIII ¹THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF MĀLWA

From the year 807 A H to the year 970 A H which is a period of one hundred and sixty three years there were eleven persons who either themselves or through their deputies governed Malwa

- Dilawar Khan Ghuri 20 years

Sultān Hushang son of Dilawar Khan 30 years

Sultān Mahmud son of Sultān Hushang one year and a few months

Sultān Mahmūd Khalji 34 years

Sultān Ghuyath ud din son of Sultān Mahmūd 20 years

Sultān Naṣir ud din son of Ghuyath ud din, 11 years and 4 months

Sultān Mahmud son of Naṣir ud din 20 years and six months and eleven days

Sultān Bahadur Gujrati 16 years

Mallu Qadir Shah 6 years

Shuja Khan as *Naib* of Sher Khan Afghan 12 years

Baz Bahadur Afghan 16 years

¹ The Section about Malwa is the heading used by the late Mr B De in his notes but the editor has followed the text edition in which M H dayat Hosain has طبعه سلاطین مالوہ Regarding the sequence of various sections see note 2 page 414

There are some variations and omissions in the lists in the MSS and in the 1st ed I have tried to get a correct list after comparing them

¹ It should not remain concealed that the country of Mālwa is an extensive territory. Great rulers have always ² been (reigned) in that country. Great Rājas and renowned Rāys like ³ Rāja Bīkramājī from the commencement of whose reign the Hindū era begins, and Rāja Bhōj and others, who were among the Rājas of Hindūstān, ⁴ possessed great renown, by their rule of Mālwa. Islām first ⁵ appeared in that country from the time of Sultān Mahmūd Ghaznavī. Among the Sultāns of Dehli Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn Balban acquired dominion over it, and after him till the time of Sultān ⁶ Firūz Shāh it was in the possession of the Sultāns of Dehli.

Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī attained to the rule of the country from a time before the reign of ⁷ Sultān Muhammad, the son of Firūz, and

¹ Firishtah copies the Tabaqāt in this place almost *verbatim* but as regards Islām, he says بعد از زمان سلطان محمود عربی که اسلام در هندوستان شائع شد. This is different from what is stated in the text, and is more correct historically. Islām certainly did not become known in Mālwa from the time of Sultān Mahmūd. Of course if the expression در آن بلاد refers to Hindūstān and not to Mālwa, then there is nothing wrong with the text.

² One MS. and the lith. ed. have می بوده اند, but the other MS. می بودند.

³ One MS. omits the word Rāja. Bīkramājī is of course a variant of the Vikramāditya. The era which dates from his accession commences 56 years before Christ.

⁴ The MSS. have داشته اند, and داشتند, and the lith. ed. has داشتند.

⁵ One MS. has پیدا شد, while the other has simply شد, and the lith. ed. has پیدا شده گرفت. The reading of the second manuscript has been followed by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text edition.

⁶ One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Firūz Shāh, but the other MS. has Sultān Muhammad Firūz Shāh. Firishtah lith. ed. in the corresponding passage has Sultān Muhammad, son of Firūz Shāh. This last statement is correct. The conquest of Mālwa took place in the reign of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn Balban in 710 A.H., 1316 A.D., and it became independent in the reign of Muhammad, the son of Firūz Tughlaq, 789 A.H., 1389 A.D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, that the date of Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī's appointment as governor is not precisely known, but he was certainly in Mālwa in 1392, and he was probably appointed by Firūz Shāh of Dehli who died in 1388. M. Hidayat Hosain has سلطان محمود فیروز شاه in the text edition.

⁷ One MS. and the lith. ed. have Sultān Mahmūd, while the other has Sultān Muhammad, son of Firūz.

declared his independence. From that time the rulers of Malwa ceased to own allegiance to the Sultāns of Dehli and eleven persons¹ ruled one after another till the time of His Majesty the Khalifa 1 Ilahī. The section about Malwa therefore begins from the time of Dilawar Khan Chūrī. They say that Sultān Muhammad son of Firuz Shah granted favours to a body of men who had accompanied him during his earlier expeditions and had shown loyalty and sincerity. When he³ became Sultān he conferred four countries on four of them and each of these four attained to sovereign power. (He) sent Zafar Khan the son of Wajih ul mulk to Gujrat, Khidr Khan to Multan and Dibalpur, Khwajah Sarwar Khwajah Jahan to whom he granted the title of⁴ Malik ush sharq to Jaunpur and Dilawar Khan Chūrī to Malwa.

⁵ AN ACCOUNT OF DILĀWAR KHĀN CHŪRĪ

As in the year⁶ 809 A H Dilawar Khan came to Malwa he brought the country into his possession by the strength of his brave

¹ One MS and the lith ed have حکومت کردند but the other MS has حکومت کرده اند the latter has been followed in the text edition.

One MS omits the words چهار کس را چهار ملک داد و هر چهار رسدند

³ One MS has رسد another رسدند while the lith ed has رسدن

⁴ M Hidayat Hosai has سلطان السرى instead of ملك السرى in the text edition.

⁵ Firsihtah's account agrees but he mentions in addition that Dilawar Khan's first capital was at Dhar but as he intended to make Shadi bad Mandu his capital he went there from time to time and endeavoured to build it. He also says that when Sultan Mahmud of Dehli fleeing from Timur came to Gujrat in 801 A H and as he was not received with due honour by Muzaffar Shah he came to Malwa and was welcomed with great honour by Dilawar Khan. He remained in Dhar till 804 A H. Alp Khan Dilawar Khan's son was not pleased with the latter for the welcome given to Sultan Mahmud and retired with most of the soldiers to Mandu where he built a very strong fort in the course of three years. In 804 A H Sultan Mahmud returned towards Dehl.

⁶ The year is 809 A H in the MSS as well as in the lith ed and the year of his death 899 A H in the MSS and in the lith ed. These dates are incorrect according to Firsihtal. According to him his rule commenced in the year 804 A H which is

arms and the power of his beneficent wisdom, and collected retainers and servants and made all arrangements and shortened the hand of encroachment of rebels from the environs and surroundings of that country. When ¹ Sultān Mahmūd passed away, and the empire of Dehli became enfeebled and heads of different bands appeared in different parts of India, Dilāwar Khān also turned his head away from allegiance to the lord of Dehli, and claimed to be independent, and in the way of ² *Bādshāhs* took upon himself the etiquette of sovereignty. He passed many years with success and pleasure, and in the year 820 A H, surrendered the deposit of his life. It has come to my notice in some books that he was ³ poisoned at the instigation of his son Alp Khān. The period of his rule was twenty years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN HŪSHANG, SON OF DILĀWAR KHĀN

Alp Khān, who was the son of Dilāwar Khān, became the successor of the latter, and had the public prayer (*Khutba*) read in his name and the coin struck in his name. He raised the royal umbrella over his head and gave himself the title of Sultān Hūshang. The *amīrs* and the great men of that country rendered homage to him.

The affairs of the kingdom, and the foundations of power had not yet been firmly fixed, when scouts brought the news, that Sultān Muzaffar Gujrāti had arrived at Ujjain, and ⁴ information had reached

also incorrect. The correct date is 789 A H, 1387 A D. The correct year of his death is 808 A H, 1405 A D. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, gives 1406 as the year of Dilāwar Khān's death.

¹ One MS. and the text edition have Sultān Muhammad, which is incorrect. See page 290 of vol. I of the translation.

² The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says, "Dilāwar Khān never assumed the style of royalty." This is not correct according either of the *Tabaqāt* or *Firishtah*. The latter is even more particular than the *Tabaqāt*. He says

دعو - استقلال کرده ، طریق سلاطین - مالیه بنام خود کرده چاره و سربرده
سرح ساخت -

³ The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says definitely Alp Khān "removed his father by poison." Neither the *Tabaqāt* nor *Firishtah* says so positively. See note 3, page 185.

⁴ The words *رسیده* *ناو* occur only in one MS. but neither in the other MS. nor in the lith. ed.

him that Alp Khan had ¹ for the sake of worldly power administered poison to Dilawar Khan and had given himself the name of Hushang Shah. As there had been a bond of brotherly feelings between Dilawar Khan and Sultan Muzaffar (the latter) had equipped an army and was marching to Malwa. In the beginning of the year 810 A.D. Sultan Muzaffar encamped in the vicinity of Dhar. Sultan Hushang came out of the fort with the determination to give battle and ² the two armies engaged each other. In the end Hushang fled and took shelter in the fort. As he found that he did not possess the power to withstand (Sultan) Muzaffar he prayed for quarter and came and waited on the Sultan. In the same *majlis* he and his nobles were placed under arrest and made over to custodians. The Sultan then left his own brother ³ Nasir Khan with a large force in the fort of Dhar and himself returned with victory and triumph to Gujrat.

As Nasir Khan who was without any experience in the very first year demanded from the *raiyats* rents which were beyond their power to pay and otherwise ill treated them. The Malwa army seizing the opportunity after the departure of Sultan Muzaffar had carried him out of Dhar by ⁴ Khwajahdars and pursuing him caused injury.

¹ The words *بواسطہ حکام دسوی* occur in one MS and in the lith ed but not in the other MS.

The Cambridge History of India page 349 says that the avenging the death of his old friend was merely a pretext for Muzaffar's invasion of Malwa.

² Firishlah says that Muzaffar was wounded and Hushang was thrown from his horse but they went on fighting but victory or defeat does not depend on one's exertions and victory was allotted to Sultan Muzaffar from the super natural world.

³ He is called *ناصر خان* Nasir Khan in the MSS and in the lith ed except in one place in the latter where he is called *ناصر خان و نصرت خان* Nasir Khan and Nusrat Khan. Firishlah lith ed calls him Nusrat Khan and Col Briggs (vol IV p 17) Noosrut Khan and in the Cambridge History of India page 349 Nusrat Khan. He was called Nasrat Khan in the History of Gujrat (see p 186 and also note 1 on the same page).

⁴ The construction of the sentence is not very clear. The corresponding passage in the history of Sultan Muzaffar Gujratī was *اورا حواجہ دار اور دھار و اورا حواجہ دار* (text edition p 34). There I thought that the *Khwajahdar* was some kind of a palace official who took him out of Dhar and showed him the way to Gujrat. Probably the word *Khwajahdar* here also has the same significance.

to such of his followers as fell behind. They left Dhār for fear of Sultān Muzaffar, erected buildings in the fort of Mandū, the strong bastions of which ¹ claimed rivalry with the celestial ² girdle or the Zodiac (and took up their residence there), and made Mūsa Khān, who was a cousin, uncle's son, of Sultān Hūshang, then chief. After this news had reached Gujiāt, Hūshang Shāh sent a petition to Sultān Muzaffar to the effect, "That the lord and master of the people of the world was in the place of this *faqīr*'s father and uncle, and the words which certain self-interested people had spoken to him were, the great God knows, contrary to the truth. At this time it was being reported that the noblemen of Mālwa had acted with disrespect to Khān-i-Ā'zam ³ Naṣir Khān, had made Mūsa Khān their leader and had taken possession of the country. If this *faqīr* was lifted up from the dust, and was placed in the bonds of gratitude, it was possible that the country should again come into his possession."

⁴ Sultān Muzaffar having approved of this proposal, released him, after he had been in prison for one year, and began to show favours to him. He took engagements from him, and after arranging his affairs, granted permission to Shāhzāda Ahmad Shāh, in the year 821 A.H., to proceed to help and reinforce him, so that he might recover possession of Dhār and the neighbouring country from the ⁵ rebellious *amīns*, and make it over to him. Ahmad Shāh recovered the country from the *amīns*, and made it over to him, and then returned to the capital city of Pattan.

After Sultān Hūshang had been in Dhār for some days, and a body of his special guards had collected round him, he sent a man to the fort of Mandū, and giving assurances of favour to the *amīns*, summoned

¹ One MS and the lith. ed. have لاف برتری رد while the other MS has لاف برابری رد, M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted the former in the text-edition.

² One MS and the lith. ed. have منطقة الروح, but the other MS has منطقة العين.

³ The name is نصر حان Nasrat Khān, here in one MS and in the lith. ed., but in the other MS it is نصر حان Nasir Khān. I have kept Nasir Khān, as he has been so named in the earlier parts of this section.

⁴ Firishtah agrees. The Cambridge History of India, page 349, says that Hūshang swore "on the Koran that he was guiltless of his father's death."

⁵ One MS omits the words from اعداء to ان تصرف امراء.

them to his side. The *amirs* and the soldiers were anxious to join him and were all pleased and delighted but as they had taken their wives and children with them to the fort of Mandu ¹ they could not join his service. Hushang went with a small force to the town of Mahesar and every day his men went forward to fight but were wounded and had to come back. As the fort of Mandū was very strong Hushang Shah considered it advisable that he should march away from that place and take up a position in the centre of the town and sending his men to the different towns and *parganas* take possession of them. About this time Malik Mughith who was the son of the aunt of Sultan Hushang had a consultation with Malik Khidr who was celebrated as ³ Miyan Agha and said: Although Musa Khan is a young man of good breeding and is a son of one of our aunts yet Hūshang Shah surpasses all his evils in manliness and intelligence and wisdom and patience and this kingdom belongs to him by inheritance as well as acquisition and besides in his childhood he was brought up in the loving arms of my mother. It is advisable therefore that the reins of this government and rule should be placed in the grasp of his power. Miyan Agha praised the decision of Malik Mughith and they in concert came out one night from the fort of Mandu and joined Sultan Hushang. The latter gave Malik Mughith a promise of being made his deputy and this gave the latter great pleasure and delight.

Musa Khan on hearing this news cut the thread of hope by the scissors of despair and became anxious about his safety. In the end he sent a messenger to Malik Mughith with the request that a place

¹ No reason is given for this in the text or in Firishtah lith. ed. but Col Briggs (vol IV p 173) says they were unwilling to abandon their families and the Cambridge History of India page 350 say: As their wives and families would be left exposed to Musa's wrath.

The name is مہنسر Mahesar in one MS. and also in the other but is partly obliterated in it. It is مہر in the lith. ed. and مہر in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. The Cambridge History of India page 350 says that Hūshang marched to Māndu.

³ The nickname looks like مہل اعا in the MS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is Miyan Khan and Miyan Agha in different places. Col Briggs (vol IV p 14) call him Meean Agha. The name is not given in the Cambridge History of India. مہل اعا in the text edition.

might be allotted to him for his residence, so that he might surrender the fort of Mandū. After much discussion, a place was fixed for him, and he evacuated the fort and went away. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort of Mandū, and took up his abode in his capital. He conferred the title of *Malik-ush-shariq* on and entrusted the duties of the *vazārat* to *Malik Mughīth*, and in all matters made him his deputy and representative.

In the year 813 A H, 1410 A D, Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī accepted the summons of God, and the government of the empire devolved upon Sultān Ahmad, the son of Muhammad Shāh the son of Sultān Muzaffar. Fīrūz Khān and Haibat Khān, sons of Sultān Muzaffar raised the standard of revolt and hostility in the country of Bahrōj, and asked for help from Hūshang. The latter returning the rights acquired by Muzaffar Shāh by the support he had given to him, and the aid given to him by Ahmad Shāh, by enmity, turned towards the country of Gujrāt, and his ancient grudge induced him to advance into that country, and to destroy the rules of the government. Sultān Ahmad advanced with a large army, and besieged Bahrōj immediately, on hearing the news. Fīrūz Khān and Haibat Khān, frightened by the ¹ grandeur and power and awed by the immense number of Ahmad Shāh's troops, prayed for protection, and joined the latter. Hūshang turned back from the way, and returned to Dhār. The narrative of these transactions has been written in detail in the section about Gujrāt.

The sweats of shame and repentance had not yet dried up on the forehead of Hūshang, when he again attempted the same kind of nefarious deeds. For when in the year 816 A H, 1413 A D, he heard that Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī had advanced to attack the ² Rāja of Jhālāwār, and was compelled to remain there, he at once collected his troops, and turned towards the country of Gujrāt. Sultān Ahmad,

¹ The readings in the MSS are *ار حوف سطوت و استلاء و همت و کثرت سناء*. The lith. ed. omits the two *و* before *همت* and *کثرت*. I have adopted the readings in the MSS, though I think that it would be better to omit the *و* before *کثرت*.

² Firishtah agrees with the *Tabaqāt* about Hūshang's first and second incursions into Gujrāt. As to the second, he calls the Rāja the Rāja of Jālwāra instead of that of Jhālāwār.

immediately on receiving this news advanced to attack and destroy him. When they approached each other and Hushang got no help from the Raja of Jhalawar he had no alternative left and returned to his own country.

After his return petitions from the *zamindars* of Gujrat and specially from the Rajas of Champaur Nadot and Idar came one after another to him to the effect that on the first occasion there had been neglect and dilatoriness in their service to him but this time there will be no minutia left in their loyal devotion in his service. If the Sultan would turn towards Gujrat they ¹ would send some guides to attend on him and they would guide his army along a road in such a way that Sultan Ahmad would not know anything about his advance up to the time of his arrival in the country of Gujrat. The indignity (of his repeated failures) being added to his former enmity induced Sultan Hushang again to collect his troops and advance into Gujrat. In order to carry out this intention he advanced in the year 821 A H 1418 A D with great pomp by way of Mahrasi. It so happened that at that time Sultan Ahmad was in the neighbourhood of Sultanpur and Nadarbar attending to some matters connected with the government. When the news of Hushang's advance reached him he considered that the extinguishing of the flame of the disturbance created by Hushang should have precedence over all other matters and he advanced to Mahrasi with speed and in spite of heavy rains he arrived there in a short time. When the spies of Sultan Hushang gave him information of the arrival of Sultan Ahmad he was in great anxiety and sent for the *zamindars* who by sending their petitions had raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion into his presence and reproached

¹ One MS and the lith ed have فرستند but the other MS has فرستد

² As to the third expedition Firishtah says that the petitions were sent by the Rajas of Jalwara of Muhammadabad Champaur of Nadot and Idar and not by the last two only as mentioned in the text. Firishtah also says that Sultan Ahmad had gone to punish Nasir Khan Faruqi who with the help of fifteen thou and horsemen sent under Chaznin Khan by Sultan Hushang was attempting to take away the fort of Thalnir from his younger brother Malik Istikhar but on Sultan Ahmad's arrival at Sultanpur and Nadarbar Chaznin Khan fled towards Malwa and Nasir Khan Faruqi went away towards Asir. After this when he was at Sultanpur Sultan Ahmad heard of Sultan Hushang's invasion.

them, and spoke unseemly words to them. In the end he returned scratching the back of his head by the same road by which he had come.

Sultān Ahmad halted at Mahīāsa for some days, so that his army might join him. After the troops ¹ had collected he advanced, in the month of Safar, into the country of Mālwa, and by repeated marches arrived at and encamped in the neighbourhood of Kālādah. Sultān Hūshang also advanced a few stages with the intention of engaging him. After the battle he fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandū. Sultān Ahmad's army ² pursued him up to the gate of Mandū, and seized some of his elephants and soldiers. Sultān Ahmad himself went as far as ³ Na'icha, and, halting there some days, sent detachments in different directions in the country. As the fort of Mandū was very strong, he was obliged to turn his reins towards Dhār. From that place he wanted to go to Ujjain, but as the rains had commenced the *amīns* and *vazīns* represented to him, that the welfare of the state demanded that he should return that year to the capital of Gujrāt and should punish the turbulent men, who had been the cause of the disturbance and rebellion, and teach them a lesson, and in the next year he should, with a mind freed from all anxieties, set about the conquest of Mālwa. Sultān Ahmad agreeing to this proposal returned from Dhār, and cast to the shadow of his favour on the people of Gujrāt.

In the year 822 A H, 1417 A D, Sultān Hūshang conferred the title of Mahmūd Khān on Malik Mahmūd, the son of Malik Mughīth, on whose clear forehead the signs of nobility and knowledge of affairs were patent and bright, and made him ⁴ the partner of his father in ⁵ the administration of the government. Whenever he went anywhere, he left Malik Mughīth in the fort of Mandū, and took Mahmūd Khān with him, so that he might attend to the affairs of state.

¹ One MS has by mistake اع instead of اءاع

² One MS has by mistake قوہ instead of عاف

³ Firishtah in his account of this expedition has instead of Na'icha Zafarābād only Na'icha. Otherwise his account agrees with that in the text.

⁴ The words با بدر are omitted in one MS.

⁵ The MSS have در مہمات, and ہمہمات, and the lith ed has در مہمات. M Hidayat Hosain has followed the lith ed in the text edition.

¹ In the year 825 A H 1421 A D Sultan Hushang selected one thousand horsemen out of his army and in the garb of merchants advanced towards Jajnagar. He took some "silver gray and iron

¹ Before describing Sultan Hushang's expedition to Jajnagar Firihlah says that Sultan Ahmad intended to invade and plunder Malwa but Sultan Hushang becoming aware of this sent eloquent ambassadors with many valuable presents and Sultan Ahmad took the presents and returned to Ahmadabad. He also says that in 83 A H 140 A D Sultan Hushang attacked the fort of Kehrila which was on the boundary of Berar. Rāy Narsingh the ruler of Kehrila met him with fifty thousand horsemen and foot soldiers and fought a fierce battle but was defeated and slain. Sultan Hushang then besieged and took the fort of Sirangadhia which belonged to Rāy Narsingh and took the treasure and 64 great elephants which were in it and reduced the son of Rāy Narsingh to be a suzerain and tributary to himself.

The following account of Sultan Hushang's expedition to Jajnagar compared with the disjointed account of it previously given in the history of Ahmad Shah of Gujrat (see pp. 340 and note p. 341) is more connected and consistent but the expedition itself was curious in various ways. It is clear that merchants used to go from Malwa and the neighbouring countries to Jajnagar or Orissa with horses and other merchandise to barter them for elephants. For the account shows that it was well known that the Rāy of Jajnagar was fond of horses of particular colour and that his subjects were likely to buy certain merchandise. It is difficult to say whether Hushang intended to barter his horses and other merchandise for elephants like an honest merchant or whether he intended from the beginning to plunder the Ray of Jajnagar (if some of his elephants which at that time were considered to be a valuable instrument of war). Probably he had an ulterior motive in his mind for looting the elephants from the beginning.

The account given by Firihlah agrees mainly with that in the text. The account in the Cambridge History of India, pages 303-31 also agrees although it calls the Orissa chief the Raja of Vijaypur the capital of Orissa. It will be seen that both the Tabaqat and Firihlah call the place Jajnagar. In the previous incidental reference to this expedition on page 98 the Cambridge History of India the expedition is designated Sultan Hushang's famous raid into Orissa and no mention is made of either Jajnagar or Juypur. It will be remembered that Sultan Ibruz Shah had hunted elephants in Jajnagar. There is a Juypur in Orissa also which is the headquarters of a civil division in the district of Cuttack but as far as I know it is not mentioned anywhere in history.

There is some difference in the readings in the description of the horses. The MSS. have اسنان بقرة و برحنگ and اسنان بقرة سر رنگ, and the lithed has اسنان بقرة سر حنگ. Firihlah in the corresponding passage has اسنان بقرة رنگ.

gray horses which the Rāy of Jājnagar was very fond of, and some other kinds of merchandise, which the people of that country took with pleasure. His object in taking this journey was this, that in exchange for the horses, and the other merchandise, he would select some elephants, and take (or buy) them. So that by means of their strength, he should be able to have his revenge against Ahmad Shāh. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Jājnagar, he sent a man to the Rāy, and gave him notice that a great merchant had come with the object of buying elephants and had brought with him many ¹ silver gray and gray and white horses, and various linen and silk stuffs and ² *narmīna*. The Rāy enquired, "Why he has encamped at a distance from the city?" The man whom Sultān Hūshang had sent replied, "He has many merchants with him and has encamped at a place where he found water and an open plain." The Rāy said, "I shall come to the caravan on such and such a date, let the horses be kept ready for my inspection on that day, and let the linen and silk goods be spread out on the ground, so that after inspecting them, I shall give in exchange for what I buy, elephants, if they want elephants, or money in cash if they want that." When the man who had been sent came back, Sultān Hūshang summoned the trusted men (among his followers) and took new engagements from them, that they should not act contrary to whatever he might order, and waited for the day (named by the Rāy).

When that day came the Rāy sent forty elephants to the caravan, in advance of himself, so that the merchants might please themselves (by inspecting them). He gave them notice that he was coming, and sent a message that they should expose their goods, and keep their horses ready. Sultān Hūshang sent back all the elephants, and spread out a part of the goods on the ground. At this time the Rāy

¹ Here the horses are described in one MS as *نقره و سر-نگ*, and in the other as *نقره و سر-نگ*, and in the lith ed as *نقره و سر-نگ*. Frishtah has *نقره رنگ و سر رنگ و کنود*. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 178) has "horses of different colours, viz bright bay, bright chestnut, and different shades of grey." M Hidayat Hosain has adopted *نقره و سر-نگ* in the text edition.

² The MSS have *نرمینه* and the lith ed has *نرمینه*. I cannot find the meaning of these words. Frishtah has no corresponding word. He has *نارۂ متاع دیگر*. M Hidayat Hosain has only *نارۂ متاع دیگر* in the text edition.

came to the caravan with five hundred men and inspected the various goods. As it was the rainy season ¹ a dark cloud appeared and drops of rain began to fall. The elephants hearing the sound of the thunder and frightened by the lightning began to run away. The goods which was spread out on the ground were spoiled under their feet. At this time a great noise rose from the caravan and Sultan Hushang in the manner of a merchant tore handfuls of hair from his head and beard and said: My merchandise has been damaged. I do not wish to live. Then with his soldiers he mounted the horses which had been already made ready and attacked the Raja's troops. At the first onset the latter lost their firm foothold and the rule of their firmness and power was shattered. Some of the men were made food for the sword and some fled. The Ray himself was taken prisoner alive.

At this time Sultān Hushang revealed his identity and said: I am Hushang Shah Ghuri. I have come to this country for (obtaining) elephants. The *rajs* and *amirs* of Jajnagar sent an emissary to wait upon the Sultan with the message that they were willing to agree to anything which the Sultān might wish. The Sultan sent the reply: There was no idea of deceit or fraud in the purpose of my coming. I came to buy elephants. My merchandise has been damaged. I have seized the Raja as a hostage in exchange of whom I would take elephants. The *rajs* of Jajnagar sent 75 splendid elephants to him and also made their excuses. Sultān Hushang returned towards his own country taking the Ray with him. When he passed the boundary of the Ray's territory he comforted him and tried to please his heart and gave him permission to go back. When the Ray arrived at his own capital he sent some more elephants to the Sultan.

On the way information reached the Sultan that Sultān Ahmad had again invaded Malwa and had besieged the fort of Mandu. When he arrived near ² the fort of Kehrā he summoned the Ray of Kehrā.

¹ One MS. has by mistake *سنة* instead of *ساي*.

See note 1 page 475 from which it will appear that according to Firishtah Sultan Hushang attacked the Ray of Kehrā before going on expedition to Jajnagar.

placed him in confinement, and took possession of the fort. He then advanced towards Mandū. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of that city, Sultān Ahmad summoned his *amīns* and soldiers from the batteries, collected them together and prepared for battle. Sultān Hūshang entered the fort by the Tāiāpūr gate and did not prepare for battle. But when Sultān Ahmad saw that the capture of the fort was difficult, and in fact impossible, he rose from the foot of the fort, and prepared to plunder and devastate the country. He passed by Ujjain, and determined to seize Sārangpūr. Sultān Hūshang on becoming aware of this determination, managed to betake himself to the citadel of Sārangpūr by another route. He then sent a message to Sultān Ahmad to the following effect, "As the rights of Musalmāns are mixed up in this, and you know ¹ yourself that the shedding of the blood of Musalmāns without any reason is fraught with great calamity, and in this case immense herds of them would perish, it is fitting that you should turn the bridle of your determination towards your own capital. ² The necessary tribute shall be sent soon after."

Sultān Ahmad's mind becoming composed owing to the (promise of) peace, he evinced negligence and carelessness in the guarding of his troops, and in taking necessary precautions and care. Sultān Hūshang taking advantage of this opportunity made a ³ night attack on the night of the 12th Muharram-ul-harām in the year 826 A H.

¹ The word حود is omitted in one MS.

² It is not clear whether this last clause is part of the message. The verb حواعد فرستاد is in the third person, which would indicate that it is not.

³ For the account of this night attack, as given in the history of the reign of Sultān Ahmad of Gujrāt, see pages 206, 207, and note 4 on page 206 and notes 1-3 on page 207. The account of the night attack as given here agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah, with the exception that in the text Rāy Sāmat is called the Rāja of Dundāh and the vulgar name of the place is given as Garī. Col Briggs (vol IV, pp 181, 182) gives the 14th (and not the 12th) Moharrum, 826 A H (29th December, 1422) as the date of the night attack. Sāmat Rāy is designated Savant Ray, Raja of Dundooka, who was "afterwards known by the name of Kuriy Raja". He also says that Ahmad Shah captured "twenty elephants belonging to Sooltan Hooshung besides seven of those he had recently brought from Jajnuggur". The Cambridge History of India passes over the night attack and the subsequent engagement.

Many people perished that night among them Ray Samat the Ray of the country of Dundūh which now on the tongues and in the mouths of the (people) is called Kari was slain with five hundred Rajputs in the vicinity of the Sultan's pavilion. Sultan Ahmad came out of the camp with only one attendant and stood on the open plain. Towards the morning men gathered round him and about the time of the true dawn which indeed was the dawn of the morning of good fortune the Sultan fell upon Sultan Hushang's troops and the battle of bloodshed and slaughter became so severe that both the *Badshahs* received wounds and in the end Sultan Hushang fled and took shelter in the citadel of Sarangpur. Seven of the Jajnagar elephants were seized by Sultan Ahmad and on the 4th of Rabi' ul akhbir of that year Sultan Ahmad turned towards Gujrat with victory and triumph.

When Hushang became aware of this he came out of the citadel of Sarangpur with great pride and audacity and started in pursuit. Sultan Ahmad turned round and confronted him. The flame of battle blazed up between the two armies and at the first onset Sultan Hushang put the army of Gujrat into confusion. Sultan Ahmad seeing this himself advanced into the battle field and fought so well that the breeze of victory and triumph began to blow upon the plumes of his standards. Hushang again fled and took shelter in the fort of Sarangpur. Then Sultan Ahmad returned to Gujrat. It may be said that on the whole Sultan Hushang was distinguished by bravery and high spirit but he was not victorious in war and in most of his battles after much striving and struggle he had to flee and to soil the skirts of his courage with the dust of flight. When authentic information arrived that Sultan Ahmad had passed over the boundary of Gujrat Hushang went from Sarangpur to the fort of Mandu. The same year after some days he repaired the damage sustained by his army and advanced to conquer the fort of Kakrun and seized it in the course of a short time. In the same year he again advanced to conquer Gwalior and by successive marches took possession of the neighbouring territory. After a month and some days had passed Sultan Mubarak Shah son of Khizr Khan marched with an army by way of Bina to aid the Ray of Gwalior. When this news reached Sultan Hushang he raised the siege and advanced to meet the army

up to the ¹ river of Dhōlpūr. After some days a peace was ratified, and it was agreed that Hūshang should give up the idea of conquering Gwāhar. The two parties then sent presents to each other and returned to their respective capitals.

² In the year 832 A H, 1428 A D, messengers swift-footed like the wind and desert-traversing scouts brought the news that Sultān Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, the ruler of the Deccan, had come with his troops, and was besieging the fort of Kehrla. When this news reached Hūshang Shāh, the humours of his spirit came to motion, and collecting a large army, he advanced to aid and succour the Rāy of Kehrla. Sultān Ahmad becoming aware of this abandoned the idea of the conquest of Kehrla, and retired towards his own country. Hūshang, at the instigation of the Rāy of Kehrla, pursued him for three stages. Sultān Ahmad then incited by his high spirit and shame turned round and engaged him. Although in the first assault defeat had fallen on the army of Sultān Ahmad, yet the latter coming out of ambush attacked the centre of Hūshang's army, and dispersed it. He fled towards Mandū, and the veiled one (his wife) with all the inmates of the harem fell into Sultan Ahmad's hands. The latter followed the path of generosity, and after making necessary ³ preparations, sent them to Mandū, and sent five hundred horsemen with them to escort them. This incident has been described in detail in the section about the Sultān's of the Deccan.

In the year ⁴ 835 A H, 1431 A D, Sultān Hūshang marched out of Mandū, with the determination to conquer Kālpī. When he arrived

¹ The words are *تا آب دھولپور* in one MS and *تا آب دھولپور* in the lith ed and in the other MS. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *تا تالاب دھولپور* as far as the tank or reservoir of Dhōlpūr. I have adopted *تا آب دھولپور* as the correct reading.

² Firishtah's account contains greater details. The ruler of Kehrla is called the son of Narsingh Rāy and it is added that Sultān Hūshang came to his succour at his invitation. The way in which the battle was fought, and the way in which Sultān Ahmad captured the baggage of Hūshang's army, and the latter's wives and daughters, and treated them with great respect and hospitality, and sent them back are described in greater detail. The Cambridge History of India's account, page 351, also agrees, but Kehrla is written as Kherla.

³ One MS inserts *حرم* between *سلمان* and *مودة*.

⁴ The account of Sultān Hūshang's expedition to Kālpī, as given by Firishtah, agrees generally with that in the text, but he calls the former governor

near that place news was brought to him that Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī was coming with an innumerable host from his capital also to conquer Kalpi. He considered the destruction of Sultān Ibrāhīm should be taken up in preference to the conquest of Kalpi and advanced to give him battle. When the two armies approached each other and a battle became a matter of today or tomorrow Sultān Ibrāhīm's scouts brought the news that Mubarak Shah Sultān of Delhi, valuing himself of the opportunity, was advancing on Jaunpur. Sultān Ibrāhīm giving up the rein of control started towards Jaunpur. Hushang obtained possession of Kalpi without a contest and had the public prayer read in his name. He remained there for some days and placing the chain of gratitude on the shoulders of Qadīr Khān who was a former ruler of Kalpi returned to Malwa.

On the way he received petitions from the *thanādars* that turbulent tribes from the direction of the ¹Jatba hills had come into his kingdom and had ravaged some villages and towns and taken shelter in the reservoir of Bhīm. The description of this reservoir is as follows. In ancient times Bhīm had erected an embankment across the valley situated between (two) hills with chiselled stones. Its length and breadth were such that one bank was not visible from the other and its depth was unfathomable. Some days after this even when they were on the way Uthman Khān Shahzada sent horsemen near the pavilion of Ghāzīm Khān Shahzada who was his elder brother

of Kalpi. Abd ul Qadīr a servant of Mubarak Shah of Delhi. Hushang's invasion of Kalpi is narrated in the Cambridge History of India on page 25 in the history of the kingdom of Jaunpur and on page 32 in the history of Malwa. In the former place the governor of Kalpi is called Sadīr Khān but in the latter he is called by his correct name Qadīr Khān.

¹ The name is *جانبه* in the MSS and in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has *جانبه* and Col Briggs (vol IV p 185) has Jam hills. M Hidayat Hosain has *جانبه* Jatia in the text edition.

The name is *عربی حان* Chaznī Khān here in the MSS and in the lith ed though he was always *عربس حان* when it occurred in the section about the history of Gujrat. Firishtah has *عربس حان* here also. Firishtah gives a detailed account of the seven sons of Sultān Hushang. Of these three:

Uthman Khān, Fath Khān and Haibat Khān were united together while Almad Khān, Umar Khān and Abu Ishaq sided with Ghāzīm Khān. As to the disputes Firishtah's account agrees generally with that in the text but the

and the man seated on his horse abused Ghaznīn Khān, and spoke haish and unbecoming words about him. Although the ushers and eunuchs forbade him, he would not desist. Then the eunuchs pelted him with stones, and drove him away from the vicinity of the pavilion. 'Uthmān Khān Shāhzāda then came to protect his servants and bastinated the eunuchs. Becoming conscious of the impropriety of his conduct, however, he separated himself from the camp. He tempted the *amīns* of evil destiny with false promises, and commenced to act traitorously. When all this reached the ears of the Sultān Hūshang, the fire of wrath flamed up in the oven of his heart. He consulted Malik Mughlīth Khān Jahān. The latter told him, acts like this have been repeatedly perpetrated by the Shāhzāda, and have been pardoned. On the present occasion also the Sultān might overlook it, so that he might again join the camp. Sultān Hūshang overlooked the act as if by negligence, and Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān came back and joined the camp. When Sultān Hūshang spread the shadow of his clemency over the inhabitants of the town of Ujjain, one day he arranged a *maḡlis* of public audience, and summoned 'Uthmān Khān Shāhzāda with his two brothers, who were Fath Khān and Haibat Khān into his presence, and stood them in the place of punishment, and after reprimanding them made the three of them over to custodians. Then after some days he ordered Malik Mughlīth, that he should place them in confinement, take them with him to the fort of Mandū, and guard them there.

¹ He then advanced to chastise and punish the turbulent men of Jātba, and advancing by successive marches, broke down the embankment of the Bhīm reservoir and traversing a distance on wings of speed totally destroyed the refractory people. The Rāja of the country

three refractory princes are there said to have been put in chains, and made over to Malik Mughlīth. There are indications also of Sultān Hūshang's intentions of making Mahmūd Khān his heir, but Malik Mughlīth always pretended that he had no desire to have the sovereignty for his son.

¹ Firishtah's account of the expedition against these men agrees with that in the text almost word for word, but he calls the Rāja, the Rāja of *کوه جابا* or the Jābia hill. He also says that among the prisoners there were many daughters and sons (of the Rāja?). The references to these proceedings in Col Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India are very brief.

at the foot of the Jatba hill fled on foot and concealed himself in jungle and his family and all his treasure and wealth fell into the Sultān's hands and the towns and cities were devastated. So many prisoners were taken that they were beyond all count. The Sultān returned with victory and triumph and went to the fort of ¹ Hushangabad and passed the rainy season there.

One day he went out with the intention of hunting. While he was out a *Badakhshani* ruby fell out of his head-dress. On the 3rd day after that a man who was going on foot brought it back to him. The Sultān gave him a reward of five hundred gold *tanlas* and in connection with this he told the following anecdote. One day a ruby fell out of the crown of Sultān Firuz Shah and a man who was passing brought it to him. Sultan Firuz Shah gave him a reward of five hundred gold *tanlas* and said: This is a sign of the setting of the sun of my grandeur and after some days he departed from this ephemeral world. I also know that the thread of my life has been twisted and there are not more than a few breaths left. The men who were in the *maylis* having offered prayers (for his health etc.) submitted that. On the day on which Sultan Firuz said these words his age had reached 90 years while His Majesty the Sultan was yet in the prime of his life and success. Hushang said that

The number of one's breaths can neither be increased nor diminished. After some days he had an attack of ³ diabetes while he was still at Hushangabad. When the Sultān saw the signs of his departure and marks of his demise he started from Hushangabad towards Mandu. On the way he held a *maylis* of public audience and he gave the seal-ring of the kingdom to his true born son Chāznin Khan in the presence of the *amirs* and his personal attendants and the commanders of the army and declared him to be his heir. He held the latter's hand

¹ The Cambridge History of India page 35 says that at this time he founded the city of Hoshangabad on the Narbada but neither the Tabaqat nor Firishtah says so.

The word is *كلاه* and the Cambridge History of India page 30 calls it his jewelled crown but the Sultan would hardly have gone out hunting with a jewelled crown on his head. Col Briggs (vol IV p 185) call it his tiara.

³ The name is *سلسل بول*. The dictionary meaning is a morbid excess of urine diabete. Col Brigg calls it an attack of stone (vol IV p 186).

and placed him in charge of Mahmūd Khān. The latter after carrying out the rites of homage, submitted, "As long as there would be remnant of life left in me, I shall not hold myself excused from loyal and devoted service." The Sultān then directed the *amīrs* generally, that they should not soil the field of the kingdom by the dust of malice and hostility.

As the Sultān had, by the clarity of his perception, come to know, that Mahmūd Khān intended that the office of the sovereign should be transferred to himself, he filled his ears with counsel and advice, and bringing the rights of the support and nurture, which he had received, to his recollection, said, "Sultān Ahmād Gujātī is a monarch of great grandeur, and is a lord of the sword. He has always had the determination to conquer Mālwa, and is ¹ waiting for an opportune moment. If there is any neglect or dilatoriness in the organisation of the affairs of state, or in the supervision of the troops and subjects, or if there is any negligence in the carrying out of your duties towards Shāhzāda Ghaznīn Khān, his determination to conquer this kingdom will be strengthened, and your union will be changed to dissention."

At the next stage Shāhzāda Ghaznīn Khān sent Malik Mahmūd Nāmī, who had the title of 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Mahmūd Khān, and sent him the following message, "If you, the asylum of the *vazārat*, should strengthen the knot of allegiance by oaths, it would be the cause of my mind being greatly assured." Mahmūd Khān accepted the request of the Shāhzāda, and confirmed his promise and engagements by oaths.

Some *amīrs*, who wanted that Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān should succeed (to the throne), represented to the Sultān, through Khwājah Nasr-ul-lah Dabīr, that as Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān was also a young man of good manners and a true son, it would be right and proper that he should be released from prison, and a part of the country of Mālwa should be allotted to him as his *jāgīr*. Sultān Hūshang said, "This has also appeared to be desirable in my mind, but if ² I release

¹ The MSS have متهم، متهم. The lith ed, has متهم. I have retained this. M Hidayat Hosain has adopted متهم in the text.

² The MS as well as the lith ed have only نگذاریم which does not make the meaning quite clear. Firsihtah makes it clearer by adding the words

Uthmān Khān the affairs of the kingdom would be in danger and disorders and disturbances would take place. When Ghaznīn Khān heard that some *amirs* had tried to procure the release of Uthmān Khān he again sent Malik Mahmud Umdat ul mulk to wait on Mahmūd Khān and represented to him ¹ that they should in their presence strengthen the lofty edifice of their agreement by oaths. Mahmud Khān joined the Shahzada while he was riding on the march and again swore that as long as the last remnant of life would be left to him he would not abandon the side of the Shahzada.

When the *amirs* became acquainted with all these affairs Malik Uthman Jalal who was one of the great *amirs* sent two reliable *sardars* with Malik Mubarak Ghazi to wait on Mahmud Khān. It so happened that Malik Mahmūd Umdat ul mulk was yet in attendance on Mahmūd Khān when the prayers of Malik Mubarak Ghazi and those two *amirs* were brought to him. Mahmud Khān left Malik Mahmud Umdat ul mulk in the pavilion and himself came out and sat at the door so that Malik Mahmud Umdat ul mulk might hear

که از حسن برآمد Contrary to what is stated in the text and in Firishtah Col Briggs says that The King at his (i.e. Mahmūd Khān's) instance consented to release the young Prince Oothman Khān from confinement and to give him an estate on which he might reside and have no plea for disturbing the reign of Ghuzny Khān (vol IV pp 186 187)

¹ The readings are different and not quite intelligible. One MS has که در حضور نیکوگر مصر سامع عهد را قسم ادا نکام دعدد. The other has که در حضور نیکوگر مصر سامع عهد را قسم معکم سازد. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has که اگر حضور مصر سامع عهد را قسمی ادا نکام دعدد. None of the readings is quite satisfactory. I have adopted the reading of the first MS which agrees with that in the lith ed except that in the latter مصر has been changed my mistake to مصر. Even in this reading however the metaphor of calling the agreement a lofty edifice appears to be fantastic. In the reading in Firishtah there is no noun for the adjective سامع to qualify and it does not appear quite right that Ghaznīn Khān should call himself *faqir* in speaking to Mahmud Khān. M Hidayat Ho ain has که در حضور نیکوگر مصر. که در حضور نیکوگر مصر سامع عهد را قسم ادا نکام دعدد in the text edition.

نسود instead of نسود has been adopted in the text edition

whatever would be said. When Malik Mubārak Ghāzī came with his two companions, and ¹ conveyed the prayers of Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl and Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān, Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl represented that, "The questions of the *saltanat* and the *vazīrat* were under consideration, and when a *vazīr* like him was seated on the *masnad*, it was strange that in spite of the fact that 'Uthman Khān was adorned with liberality and courage and the qualities of administering impartial justice, and of protecting and helping the *ra'īyats*, it should be decided, that Ghaznīn Khān should be declared as the heir to the throne. Moreover 'Uthmān Khān has the relationship of a son-in-law to the Malik-ush-sharq (i.e., Malik Mughlīth, father of Mahmūd Khān), and therefore his sons are also your (i.e., Mahmud Khān's) sons. If infirmity had not prevailed over the Sultān, and ² if an error had not occurred in his righteousness, he would never have attempted to do such a thing. All the Khāns and *amīrs* urge you, that paying (favourable) attention to the circumstances of 'Uthmān Khān you would not withdraw your hand of support from his head, for if the work of the sovereignty is transferred to 'Uthmān Khān, the kingdom would again acquire greatness and splendour." Mahmūd Khān replied, "A slave or servant is concerned only with slavery and service. As to authority or over-lording ³ he knows. In the whole

¹ There is some difference in the readings. One MS has دعاء ملک عثمان. The other MS has دلال و ساء راده عثمان حان رسایید - ملک عثمان دلال معروف و صداشت. The other MS inserts و گفت between رسایید and دلال, while the lith. ed. has رسایید گفت. I have adopted the first reading, but M. Hidayat Hosain has inserted و گفت between رسایید and ملک عثمان. According to lith. ed. of Firishtah also it was Malik 'Uthmān Khān Jalāl who was sent by the partisans of 'Uthmān Khān with Malik Mubārak Ghāzī, but the latter as in the text was the spokesman of the party. Malik 'Uthmān Jalāl is called Mullik Othman Julwany by Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 187).

² The MSS and the lith. ed. of Firishtah all say و در موی قدوری راه نمی یافت, thus appears to be incorrect. I have adopted the reading of the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt which has نصوی instead of موی, but M. Hidayat Hosain has retained موی in the text-edition.

³ It is او دادند in both the MSS, the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah. I suppose the او or he refers to the Sultān.

period of my service I have never strayed after what is beyond my province

When Malik Mubarak Ghazī obtained permission to leave (Mahmud Khan) called Malik Mahmud Umdat ul mulk outside and said Go and report this to the Shahzada Malik Mahmud went and narrated what had happened The Shahzāda's mind being now reassured about Mahmūd Khan was highly pleased

After the *amirs* had become despondent of the life of Sulṭan Hushang ¹ Zafar Minjumla who was the *peshua* of Malik Uthman Jalal fled from the camp of Sulṭan Hushang with the intention of winning over the custodians of Uthman Khan and arranging for the latter's escape When this news reached Mahmūd Khan he immediately acquainted Shahzada Ghaznun Khan of it so that he might try to remedy what had happened The Shahzāda sent Malik Barkhurdar - Malik Hasan and Shaikh Malik to seize Zafar Minjumla Malik Barkhurdar and Malik Hasan asked for horses which should be ³ fresh and strong He ordered that fifty horses should be given to them from the royal stables As the superintendent of the stables was a partisan of Uthman Khan Shahzada he said in reply As long as the Sulṭan is alive I shall not give a single horse without his express order and going to one of the chief eunuchs who was also a partisan of Uthman Khan ⁴ repeated these words to him The wretched Khwajah supposing that these words would be the cause

¹ Firsihtah lith ed calls him *takīl* instead of *peshua* of Malik Uthman Jalal Col Briggs calls him Zuffar Khan a person of Prince Oothman's party (vol IV p 187)

One MS has Malik Husain instead of Malik Hasan and neither MS has the *و* between Malik Hasan and Shaikh Malik The name of Shaikh Malik is omitted in the next sentence in the MSS Firsihtah lith ed has Malik Hasan and Malik Barkhurdar and omits Shaikh Malik altogether Col Briggs says that Ghizny Khan ordered a party of fifty men of the royal guards to overtake and bring back Zuffar Khan (vol IV p 187)

³ The word is ناره روز

⁴ The words *قبر نمود حواجه بی دولت این سخن را* are omitted in one MS and in the lith ed The MSS and the lith ed are very incorrect and imperfect here and I am rather doubtful about the correct reading As to the word *بی دولت* as an epithet of *حواجه* I do not know what it really means but it may mean wretched though why this epithet should be used I do not know

of the Sultān's protest and anger, explained to the superintendent of the stables to go near the place, where the Sultān was lying and to repeat these words in a loud voice, so that they might reach the Sultān's ears, and make an impression on his mind, that even while he was still alive, Ghaznīn Khān was stretching his hand to seize his property. When the superintendent of the stables said these words with vigor and emphasis, the Sultān in his unconsciousness, having regained a little perception, said, "Where is my quiver?" and called for the *amīrs*.

The *amīns*, thinking that God forbid¹ that the Sultān should have died, and Ghaznīn Khān should have got hold of us by means of this trick, and should destroy us, did not go to the Sultān¹ except Mahmūd Khān. When this news reached Ghaznīn Khān a great fear and awe fell upon his heart, and he fled and went to Kākīūn, which was three stages from the camp. He sent Malik Mahmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk to wait on Mahmūd Khān with the following message, "All the *amīns* have combined together to raise 'Uthmān Khān to the throne, and I have no one to support me except yourself. As the Sultān had called for his quiver, I thought that he might after arriving at Mandū imprison me also, and place me beside my brothers." Mahmūd Khān sent the following reply, "You have never done anything contrary to the wishes of the Sultān. I shall explain to the Sultān, the matter of your order about giving the horses, at the right moment." Ghaznīn Khān again sent Malik Mahmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk, with the following message, "Although you, the asylum of the *vazānat*, have taken me by the hand, yet as I know that the eunuchs have communicated some displeasing words (about me) to the Sultān, fear has overwhelmed me." Mahmūd Khān sent this message, "There is no² matter. Do you please return soon to the camp, for there is little time, and the sun is about to set." He also wrote a letter in the presence of Malik Mahmūd 'Umdat-ul-mulk and sent it to Malik Mughīth to the following purport, "His Majesty the Sultān has

¹ The words *والله* occur in the MS, and in the lith. ed. The meaning is doubtful.

² The word is *فَصْلَة*, or *فَصْلَة* in the MS, and in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. also has *فَصْلَة*.

declared Ghaznīn Khān to be his heir and successor. His Majesty's illness has made him very weak and those who are near him have given up all hope of his life. It is right that you should make every endeavour to guard Shāhzada Uthman Khān.

When Malīk Mahmūd went and waited upon Ghaznīn Khān and gave him Mahmūd Khān's message and described the purport of the letter he was delighted and came back to the camp. When ¹ Malīk Ānchhī, the pymaster of the forces and the eunuchs who were partisans of Uthman Khān saw that there was a breath left in the Sultān they determined among themselves that early next morning they would place him in a palanquin without informing the *amirs* and Mahmūd Khān and go with all speed to Mandu and bringing Shāhzada Uthman Khān out of prison place him on the throne. Mahmūd Khān having obtained information of the plan became watchful for the death of Hushang. He ordered the palanquin to be placed on the ground there and then ² Ghaznīn Khān under

¹ The name is ملك انجھا in the MS and ملك انجھا in the lith ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has حال جہاں.

One MS omits Mahmūd Khān. The other MS has امرا و محمود حال. The lith ed has امراء محمود حال. Firishtah lith ed has Mahmūd Khān. I have adopted the second reading but it may be that the reading of the lith ed is correct for there is no reason why the *amirs* who were in favour of Uthman Khān should be kept in ignorance of the plan. If this reading is correct then the text would be the *amirs* on the side of Mahmūd Khān instead of the *amirs* and Mahmūd Khān.

² There is some difference in the readings here also. The MSS have عرس بفرمودہ عرس حال while the lith ed has محمود حال. Ghaznīn Khān was so much under the thumb of Mahmūd Khān that it is quite possible that he should have acted under the orders of the other and therefore the reading in the MS which I have accepted is correct though one would have thought that whatever the actual relations of the two men might have been Mahmūd Khān would have outwardly at least acted under the orders of Ghaznīn Khān and not *vice versa*.

Firishtah gives a slightly different account. He says that the Khān Jahan and the eunuchs started with the palanquin with the dying Sultan in it. After they had gone some distance the Sultan died. Mahmūd Khān obtaining information of this sent men so that they might reprimand the eunuchs about their haste and keep the palanquin there. The eunuchs explained that Hushang had ordered that he should be carried to Mandu as quickly as possible and they

the orders of Mahmūd Khān had the royal pavilion fixed up, and occupied himself in putting the corpse into a shroud and coffin. Each one of the *amīrs* (apparently of the opposite faction) went to a secluded place and stayed there.

After the enshrouding of the corpse Mahmūd Khān came out, and said in a loud voice, "Sultān Hūshang has died under Divine Dispensation, and has made Ghaznīn Khān his heir and successor. Whoever is with us should come and make his homage, and whoever is against us should separate himself from the camp, and should go about his own affairs." Mahmūd Khān then ¹ kissed Ghaznīn Khān's hand, and having rendered him homage, wept much. Then the other *amīrs* one after another kissed Ghaznīn Khān's feet, and wept, crying Alas! Alas! When the accession of Ghaznīn Khān was confirmed by the homage of the *amīrs* and of the great men of the age, they took up the corpse of Sultān Hūshang and carried it towards the ² *madhassa*, and on the 9th³ Dhī-hijjah, 838 A H, consigned it to the dust.

Verses

Where are the kings of Jamshīd-like power,
From Hūshang and Jamshīd to Isfandiyār!
Farīdūn and Kaikhosrū and ⁴ Jām Kū,

were only carrying out his orders. Ghaznīn Khān and Mahmūd Khān did not give any reply, and the latter ordered the royal pavilion to be set up, and commenced to put the Sultān's corpse into the shroud and coffin.

¹ I think this is the first time in this history, that the ceremony of the kissing of the hands is mentioned. Of course there are plenty of instances of kissing the feet and of kissing the ground near the *Bādshāh's* seat or feet. Here also the other *amīrs* kissed the feet while Mahmūd Khān alone was privileged to kiss the hand.

² Firishtah adds in Shādīābād Mandū

³ Col Briggs (vol IV, p 189) gives the Hijri date as the 9th Zeehuj, 835 and the corresponding A D date as 7th September, 1432. The correct date according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah is 9th Dhī-hijjah, 838 A H. The Cambridge History of India, page 352, gives July 6th, 1435, as the date of Sultān Hūshang's death. The correct A D date according to Sewell and Dikshit's Indian Calendar appears to be 7th September, 1435.

⁴ I cannot exactly find out what *Jām Kū* means.

Where are gone Shapūr and Bahram ¹ Gur
 They all rest their heads on brick and dust
 Happy he who sows of good sowed not seed !

A grand assemblage was convened in the palace of Sultān Hushang and Malīk Muḡhith Khān Jahan and all the other *amirs* rendered homage and performed the ceremony of making thanks offerings

The period of Hūshang's reign was thirty years The date of his death (838 A H) can be found and understood from the words

Alas ! Shah Hushang is no more

AN ACCOUNT OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH SON OF HŪSHANG SHĀH GHŪRI

When Hushang Shah accepted the summons of the just God on the 11th Dhi hujjah the *amirs* against their wishes but by the exertion of Malīk Muḡhith and the arrangements made by Mahmud Khān rendered homage anew to Ghaznīn Khān who had been chosen by Hūshang He distinguished each one of the *amirs* by conferring on them robes of honour and titles and assured them (of safety) - The great and well known men of Malwa were made happy by the grant of rewards and stipends The city of Mandu received the name of Shādīabād and the public prayers having been read and the coins struck in the name of Ghaznīn Khān he received the title of ³ Sultān Muhammad Shah Every one who had a fief or a stipend anywhere had it confirmed and resettled In short although the *amirs* had not been pleased with Ghaznīn Khān being made the Sultān yet owing to the excellence of the management and the skill of Malīk Muḡhith and Mahmud Khān a new grandeur and splendour appeared in the administration The people became the new Sultān's adherents and in affection for him gained an ascendancy over the empire of men's heart He conferred the title of Masnad ī Alī Khān Jahan on

¹ One MS has گور the other MS and the lith ed of Firishtah have گور
 The lith ed of the Tabaqat has گور The name of Bahram is so closely associated with گور or the wild ass which he hunted that I have thought that the reading should be گور بهرام M Hidayat Hosain has گور بهرام in the text edition

One MS inserts an و before اکبر

³ One MS omits the word سلا

Malik Mughīth, and kept the reins of the *vazārat*, as before, in his powerful grasp

But as after some days he made attempts on the lives of his brothers, and shed unrighteous blood, and drew the pencil across the eyes of Nizām Khān, his nephew and son-in-law, and of the three sons of the latter, men's heart were filled with abhorrence of him, and hatred took the place of love in them. The blood of his murdered brother was necessarily not a good omen for him, and in a very short time the rule of the empire passed out of his dynasty. ¹ Disturbances and rebellion, ² which had fallen asleep in the country, awoke again, and refractory and turbulent men ³ raised the standard of violence, and the dust of disturbance and rebellion

Couplet

If evil thou hast done, hope not danger to escape,
For, it is right for nature to retaliate

Among the others the Rājput̃s of the country of ⁴ Hārūtī placed their feet outside the circle of allegiance and raided a part of the kingdom. When this news reached Sultān Muhammad Shāh, he nominated Khān Jahān on the 11th of Rabī'ul-āwwal 839 A H, to punish them and bestowing two elephants and a special robe of honour on him, started him on the expedition

He placed the affairs of the soldiery and the *ra'iyats* on the shelf of oblivion, and contracted the habit of continual drinking. He always united and joined up the morning draughts with the evening draughts and *vice versa*. At last one day a number of the old wretches sent him a message through an inmate of his harem, to the effect,

¹ One MS has *امد* *بعد* after *اشوب*

² One MS has *هفته* instead of *شد* *حواب*

³ One MS has *برانگيحه* instead of *انگيحه*

⁴ The name is *هاروتي* in the MS and in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has *نادوني*, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 192) has Nandote. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the rebellion here, or the expedition under Malik Mughis to crush it, but later on after Mahmūd Khān had seized the palace, he is said, on page 353, "to have summoned his father, who was engaged in hostilities against the Hāra Rājputs of Harāotī" *هاروتي* cannot, however, be transliterated as Harāotī. It can be transliterated either as Hārūtī or Hārautī. M. Hidayat Hosain has *حادوتي* Hādūtī in the text

that a crow of greed had laid an egg of pride in the brain of Mahmūd Khan and he was thinking how he could remove the Sultān out of the way and himself sit on the throne of empire. Sultan Muhammad made an agreement with those men that before Mahmud Khan could carry this wicked wish from potentiality to actual facts he himself should be removed out of the way. When this news reached Mahmud Khan he said ¹ 'Praise be to God' that the breach of the agreement has not occurred from my side. He occupied himself in attending to his own affairs and always collected troops and retainers. He went to wait on Sultān Muhammad with great caution and care. When the Sultān observed the cautious ways of Mahmud Khan it became the cause of increased anxiety and fear. One day he seized Mahmud Khan's hand and took him into the harem. He called his wife who was a sister of Mahmud Khan and said in her presence

It is my hope that you will not do any harm to my life and the affairs of the kingdom will be in your charge without any contention or hostility. Mahmud Khan said. Perhaps the engagements and oaths have passed out of the Sultān's mind that he brings such words on his tongue. If some malicious persons for their own wicked purpose have spoken words to him he will in the end be abashed and ashamed. If there is any fear or apprehension of me in the mind of the Sultān I am now alone and there is nothing to prevent it (my death).

Couplet

If for loyalty you are here are my heart and life
If for enmity here are the charger and my head

Sultān Muhammad then made his excuses and the two men behaved with softness and flattery. But as the Sultan was obsessed by his suspicions words and jestures indicating his ²distrust appeared

¹ The phrase is written in different ways. It is **لله الحمد** in one MS and in the lith ed and is **الله الحمد لله** in the other. Firishtah lith ed has **الحمد لله على كل**. M Hidayat Hosain has correctly **لله الحمد** in the text edition.

One MS has **هبة وبنا جمع وبنا** instead of **هبة وبنا جمع وبنا** which occurs in the other and in the lith ed.

² One MS and the lith ed have **نا اعمادي** but the other MSS have what looks like **ما اعقاي**.

from him every moment Mahmūd Khān began to make great exertions and endeavours in gaining his objects. He tempted the Sultān's cup bearer with much gold, and had the Sultān killed by giving him poison in his wine. The tongue of the circumstances of Sultān Muhammad thus victimised and done to death, began to sing in this tune, and the faithless time throw up this noise into the curve of the arch of the sky.

couplets

A few breaths, I said with pleasure, shall I take,
 Alas! they were stopped on the path from my heart
 Alas! that at the table of the vands of life,
 I, for a moment partook, and then they said 'stop'

When the *amīrs* became cognisant of this, ¹ Khwājah Nasr-ul-lah ² Parniyānī and Malik Mashūr-ul-mulk, and Latīf Zakariyā and some other *sardārs* combined together, and bringing Shāhzāda Mas'ūd Khān, who was in his thirteenth year, out of the harem, placed him on the throne. They agreed among themselves, that they would remove Mahmūd Khān out of the way by any means that they could. They sent Malik Bāyazīd Shaikhā to him, and told him, "Sultān Muhammad Shāh has sent for you to come with great quickness, and wishes ³ to send you as an ambassador to Gujrāt." As Mahmūd Khān was aware of the death of Sultān Muhammad he replied, "I have relinquished the duties of the *vazīrat*, and wish to pass the remaining years of my life, as a sweeper of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang. But notwithstanding this determination of mine, as the marrow of my bones has been nourished by the beneficence of Hūshang Shāh,

¹ The names are as I have them in the text in one MS. except that of Mashūr-ul-mulk, which is that of Shēr ul mulk. In the other the name is Malik Mashūr-ul-mulk, and in the lith. ed. Parniyānī is written as Har-ānī, otherwise they agree with the first MS. Firsihtah lith. ed. has Khwājah Nasr Ullah, *vazīr*, and Mashūr-ul-mulk and Latīf Dhakariyā. The names are not given by Col. Briggs and in the Cambridge History of India. The former (vol. IV, p. 193) has, "The officers about the king's person", and the latter (page 353) "a faction among the nobles."

² M. Hidayat Hosain has دیر بنانی Dīrnibānī in the text.

³ The MSS. have رسول, and the lith. ed. has رسولى. It is برسولى in the corresponding passage in the lith. ed. of Firsihtah. This would mean, wishes to send you on an embassy, and appears to be a better reading than the others.

if all the *amirs* would come to my house then after discussing ¹ all differences of counsels we would report to the Sultan whatever is determined upon as appears to be right and proper

Mahik Bayazid Shāikhā returned to the *amirs* and informed them that Mahmud Khan has not yet received the news of the Sultan's death if you will all go together to his house he will go with you to the palace and he can then be disposed off Acting on Bayazid Shāikhā's words the *amirs* went to Mahmūd Khan The latter had kept his men ready in concealed places When the *amirs* entered he asked Has the Sultan recovered his senses or is he still lying drunk? ³ The *amirs* knew what he was saying After a moment his men came out of the chambers and fell upon the *amirs* They seized all of them and made them over to guards As the lofty edifice of the remaining *amirs* who were with Masūd Khan tottered under the blow of this news they collected their troops and made the retinue of the Sultan ready and bringing the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultan Hushang raised it over the head of Masūd Khan

Mahmud Khan on hearing this news mounted and advanced towards the palace with the object of seizing both the Shahzadas and disposing off them When he got near the palace both sides seized their arrows and spears and the battle of slaughter and bloodshed lasted till night When the lord of the stars (that is the sun) hid himself behind the veil of darkness Shahzada Umar Khan got down from the fort and took the path of flight and Masūd Khan took sanctuary with Shāikh Jaldah who was one of the great (holy) men of the age The *amirs* fled and betook themselves to the corners of safety Mahmud Khan remained in front of the palace till the morning fully armed and ready for all emergencies When the white light of morning appeared from the sea of the darkness of night

¹ One MS has سقون کنگاس the other has سقون و کنگاس and the lith ed has سقون کنگاس Firishtah lith ed has سقون و کنگاس The first reading is followed in the text edition

The word is بهان حانها The corresponding word in Firishtah lith ed is گوشها corners

³ The meaning of this is not quite clear but the same words occur in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in the lith ed of Firishtah

news was brought to him, that the palace was empty, and the enemies, each one of them, had hid themselves in corners

Mahmūd Khān then entered the palace, and sent a swift messenger to summon his father Khān Jahān. The latter arrived on the wings of speed. Mahmūd Khān assembled the *amīrs* and *Maliks* and sent the following message to Khān Jahān. ¹ "The world cannot exist without a ² ruler. If the throne of the empire remains unoccupied by the person of a sovereign, many disturbances are produced in the world from the womb of time, the suppression of which becomes difficult. The kingdom of Mālwa has become extensive and refractory, and turbulent men have not yet wakened from sleep. Also the news has not yet reached the Sultāns of the surrounding countries. Otherwise they would have advanced towards us from all directions." Khān Jahān sent the following reply. ³ "No one should attempt to assume ⁴ this exalted position, which is a twin brother of the rank of the Prophet, unless he is possessed of the qualities of exalted lineage and perfect generosity and bravery and justice and wisdom, (and unless this is the case) the affairs of the empire do not acquire grandeur and glory. Praise be to God! that my son has all those qualities, which a Sultān should possess. It behoves him (therefore) that at an auspicious moment, he should place his foot on the *masnad* of the *saltanat*, and seat himself on the throne of

¹ The message does not contain a direct appeal to Malik Mughīth to assume the sovereignty of Mālwa, though it implies it. Firishtah lith ed., however, says that Mahmūd Khān wrote to Khān Jahān, that the *saltanat* belongs by right to you, and you should come quickly and seat yourself on the throne. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, also says that Mahmūd Khān "offered the crown to his father", but the latter "declined the honour".

² Both MSS have incorrectly جهانان, people of the world. The lith ed has the correct reading جهانانی a ruler. Firishtah in the corresponding passage also has جهانانی.

³ Khān Jahān's message as given in the MSS, and in the lith ed appears to me to be incomplete. It appears to me that some word like کسی should be inserted before متقلد and some words like نباید سد after بدو, and the کسی after تا is changed to او. Firishtah lith ed omits the words from متقلد to بدو, and then the sentence makes good sense.

⁴ One MS and the lith ed have ان but the other MS has این. This latter appears to me to be better.

empire When the messenger brought this message all the *amirs* and great men applauded this sentiment and attested to the truth of the word The astrologers who knew the stars were ordered that they should select an auspicious moment for the accession All the *amirs* and the wise men of the kingdom and the great men of the city kissed Mahmud Khan's hand and congratulated him on his accession

Couplet

If one goes another in his place doth come

The world never without a bridegroom (ruler) is

The period of the rule of Sultan Muhammad was one year and some months

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD KHALJĪ

The narrators of the histories of the Sultan have related that on Monday ¹ the 29th of the month of Shawwal in the year 839 A H Sultan Mahmud Khalji ascended the throne of the *Khilafat* of Malwa His age at that time had attained to 34 years In the whole of the country of Malwa public prayers were read and coins struck in his name All the *amirs* were gladdened with kindness and favour and the stipends and rank of each were increased A number of them were selected and received titles Among these Mashir ul mulk had the title of Nizam ul mulk conferred on him and the reins of the *vazarat* were placed in his powerful hands Malik Barkhurdar received the title of Taj Khan and the office of the pay master of the kingdom was entrusted to him Khan Jahan received the title of Ā zam Humayun and an umbrella and white quiver which were specially reserved for sultans were bestowed on him and it was also settled that the harems and equeries of Ā zam Humayun should have staffs of gold and silver in their hands and whenever he should mount or dismount should say in a loud voice In the name of the benevolent and merciful God¹ which in those days was the exclusive privilege of sultans

¹ Col Briggs (vol IV page 196) gives the corresponding A D date as May 16th 1435 The Cambridge History of India page 353 gives 13th May 1436 as the date of Mahmud Khalji's accession According to Sewell and Dikshat's Indian Calendar the day and date appear to be Thursday the 24th of August 1435

When the empire was firmly fixed on Sultān Mahmūd, he devoted his energy to the support of learned and wise men, and whenever he heard of any person of great ability, he sent money to him, and summoned him. He also established colleges in his kingdom, and granted stipends to the learned men and to students, and kept them occupied with imparting and receiving knowledge and learning. In short, the country of Mālwa in the period of his rule became an object of envy to Shīrāz and Samarqand.

As the work of the government was properly administered and all the affairs of the kingdom acquired order, ¹ Malīk Qutb-ud-dīn Shaibānī and ² Malīk Nasīr-ud-dīn Dabīr, and a number of the other Hūshang Shāhī *amīns*, owing to their envy, attempted to act treacherously in concert with ³ Malīk Yūsuf Qawām. With the object of carrying out their intention, they placed a ladder one night, and climbed to the roof of a *masjid* which was adjacent to the palace of Mahmūd Shāh. From that place they came down to the courtyard of the palace, and were thinking what they should do next. At this time Mahmūd Shāh appeared there, and with very great bravery came out of the house with his quiver bound round him, and coming within bow-shot wounded some (of them). About this time ⁴ Nizām-ul-mulk and Malīk ⁵ Mahmūd Khidr arrived fully armed.

¹ The suffix to the name is شایبانی Shaibānī in both MSS, but it is رسانی Rustānī in the lith ed and سمانی Sumnānī in the lith ed of Firishtah. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 197) has Sumnamī.

² He is called ملک نصیر الدین دبیر in one MS, and in the lith ed and ملک نصیر الدین دبیر in the other MS. Firishtah lith ed has ملک نصیر الدین دبیر حرجانی and Col Briggs has Nuseer-ood-deen Joorjany. Is he the same man as Khwājah Nasr-ul-lah Parniyānī mentioned on page 494 and in note 1 on the same page?

³ He is so called in both MSS. The lith ed calls him, evidently by mistake, Malīk Yūsuf Qawm. Firishtah lith ed has Malīk Yūsuf Qawām-ul-mulk. Col Briggs does not mention him. The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of any of the conspirators.

⁴ Firishtah lith ed calls him Mashīr-ul-mulk, who had the title of Nizām-ul-mulk.

⁵ Both MSS call him what I have called him in the text. The lith ed erroneously inserts a و between Malīk Mahmūd and Khidr. Firishtah lith ed has Malīk Muhammad Khidr.

from outside with a body of *silāhdars*. The conspirators fled by the very route by which they had entered and made their escape. One of them however who had been wounded by an arrow could not descend by the ladder and threw himself on the ground from the roof of the mosque. His leg was broken and he was seized and was taken (before the Sultān?) and he wrote down the names of all the men who were among the conspirators. Early next morning they were all brought before the Sultān and were punished.

But Āzam Humayun begged for the ¹ pardon of the offences of Shāhzada Ahmad K̲han son of Hushang Shah and Malīk Yusuf Qawam and Malīk Anchhā and Malīk Naṣir ud dīn Dabīr although they had had a full share in creating the disturbance and selected the fort of Islamabad for the Shahzada and conferred the title of Qawam K̲han and the fief of Bhūlsa on Malīk Yusuf Qawam the fief of Hushangabad on Malīk Anchhā and the title of Naṣrat K̲han and the fief of Chanderī by deputation (*Niyabat*) to Malīk Naṣir ud dīn. They obtained leave to go to their *jagirs*. When Shahzada Ahmad K̲han reached Islamabad he at once raised the dust of disturbance and rebellion. His forces began to increase day by day and although Taj K̲han who had been nominated to suppress them sat down at the foot of the fort of Islamabad he was unable to effect any result. Ahmad K̲han sent out a detachment every day from the fort and kept (the men at) the foot of the fort hotly engaged in battle. Taj K̲han sent a petition and begged for reinforcements. About this time scouts brought the news to the Sultān that Malīk Anchhā the feudatory of Hushangabad and Naṣrat K̲han the feudatory of Chanderī had raised the flag of hostility and the standard of revolt. Sultān Mahmūd sent Āzam Humayun K̲han Jahan to teach the rebels a lesson and to arrange all the affairs of the country. When the latter arrived within two *larohs* of Islamabad Taj K̲han and the other *sardars* hastened to meet him and explained the true state of

¹ The word is *استعفاء* in one MS and *استعفاي* in the other. The lith. ed. has what looks like *ار* ¹⁰ ! Firishtah lith. ed. has *استعفاي*. M. Hidayat Hossain has adopted *است* ¹ in the text edition.

² He is not mentioned by Firishtah here but later on in the distribution of fiefs he is called *ملک جہاد* in the lith. ed. and Mullik Itihād by Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 193).

things to him. On the second day, he started, and having occupied the environs of the fort, distributed the batteries. The next day he sent a number of wise men and Shaikhs to Ahmad Khān, so that they might after filling his ears with the pearls of advice and the gems of precepts, warn him of the evil effects of a breach of agreements and engagements. Although the Shaikhs and learned men read the texts of persuasion and intimidation to him, his stony heart did not become affected. In reply to the sound precepts he gave equally rare replies, and having given permission to the kind-hearted preceptors sent them out of the fort. Qawām Khān also, acting in a spirit of hostility, sent some arms and other war-like materials to him from his own battery, and strengthened the ¹ foundations of amity by promises and engagements. When the ² siege was prolonged, ³ one day one of the musicians gave poison to Ahmad Khān in his wine, and throwing himself out of the citadel joined the camp of Ā'zam Humāyūn, and the fort was captured. Ā'zam Humāyūn after arranging matters there left one of his trusted men at that place, and marched towards Hūshangābād.

On the way Qawām Khān fled from Ā'zam Humāyūn's camp, and went away towards Bhilsā. Ā'zam Humāyūn considered the overthrow of Malik Anchhā to be of primary importance, and continued his advance to Hūshangābād. Malik Anchhā, finding that he had not the strength to meet him, left all his equipage and other things, and went away towards the foothills of Gōndwāna. When the Gōnds knew that he had turned his face from his lord and master, they collected in large numbers and blocked his way, and killed all of them by pelting them with stones, and shooting them with arrows, and plundered all their goods and property. Ā'zam Humāyūn on

¹ One MS. and the lith. ed. have بنان, but the other MS. has بنیاد

² One MS. has کار محاصره, the other omits کار, while the lith. ed. has طول محاصره. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has کار محاصره

³ Firishtah makes this somewhat clearer by saying ساحتگی اہم ہمایوں, i.e., either at the instigation of Ā'zam Humāyūn or for some other reason, and adds رھر دادہ نکست. The Cambridge History of India, page 353, says *positively* that Ahmad Khān was poisoned "at the instigation of Mughis."

hearing this news was highly pleased and entered the fort of Hushangabad. He arranged the affairs of that quarter in the best manner and left one of his trusted men there and advanced towards Chanderi to chastise Naṣrat Khān.

When he arrived within two stages of Chanderi Naṣrat Khān finding himself weak and helpless came out to meet him and wanted ¹ to cover up his misdeeds with grass. Āzam Humayun sent for the Saiyids and the learned and great men of the city and collected them together and asked each one of them to describe the behaviour and circumstances of Naṣrat Khān. Each one of them told a story most of which were that the crow of pride and vanity had laid an egg in his brain so that marks of hostility and rebellion have made their appearance. Āzam Humayun transferred the government of Chanderi from Naṣrat Khān to Malik ul umarī Hājī Kamal and advanced towards Bhilsa. Although he sent men of rank to Qawām Khān and tried to guide him in the right path it was productive of no good result. Qawām Khān got out of Bhilsa and fled. Āzam Humayun halted there for a few days and after assuring his mind of the affairs of that country turned his face towards the capital city of Shadiabad.

On the way news was brought to him that Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī was advancing with the object of conquering Malwa and had sent Shahzada Mas'ud Khān with a large army and twenty elephants ² to attack him. Āzam Humayun started with rapidity and passing the army of Sultān Ahmad at a distance of six *karohs* entered the fort of Mandu by the Tarapur gate. Mahmud Shah was delighted at the arrival of his father and performed the rites of offering thanks to God. He sent out detachments every day from the fort and went on fighting hard. With great bravery and courage he wanted to sally out of the fort and engage in a drawn battle. But as the thorn of the hostility of the Hushang Shahī *amirs* had caught in his skirts

¹ The words are *حسن نوس سار* in the MSS and in the lith ed and also in the lith ed of Firīhtah.

² The name is a in the text in the MSS and in the lith ed but Col Briggs (vol IV p 913) Mullik Kaloo.

³ Both MSS and the lith ed have *نرسر سما*. Firīhtah lith ed in the corresponding passage has *نرسر*.

and a sort of caution had taken possession of his mind, so that he considered those who were near him, in spite of the kindness with which he had treated them, to be his ¹enemies. But having regard to their hostility and opposition, he stretched out his hands of generosity and benefactions from the sleeve of liberality and munificence, and kept all the men, even in the narrow and straitened circumstances of the siege, ²satisfied and contented. He also distributed grain from the (royal) granaries to *faqīrs* and poor men. On account of his great generosity, grain was cheaper in the fort than it was in Sultān Ahmad's camp. He established boarding houses for *faqīrs* and poor men, and gave them cooked and uncooked food. He also summoned to his service some *amīns* such as ³Sayyid Ahmad and Sūfī Khān, son of 'Alā-ul-mulk, and Malik-ush-sharq, and Malik Muhammad, son of Ahmad Silāh, and Malik Qāsim, and Hīsām-ul-mulk Hāndērī who had an attitude of rebellion and hostility to

¹ The MSS have اعداد عدوى حرد and اعدا وعدو حرد, and the lith ed has اعدای خود. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has اعدا وعدو حرد. The necessity of the insertion of the words وعدو is not very clear.

² Both MSS and the lith ed have اسودة و مدعم but the other MS has اسودة و ناعم. Firishtah lith ed has only اسودة.

³ There is considerable difference in the names. There is no difference as regards the first name, but one MS omits the و after it, which makes it doubtful whether Sayyid Ahmad and Sūfī Khān are two men or only one. There is also no و between Sayyid Ahmad and Sūfī Khān in the lith ed of Firishtah, and the father's name is given there as 'Imād-ul-mulk and not 'Alā-ul-mulk. The name of Malik-ush-sharq occurs in the MS but is omitted from the lith ed, and is changed to Malik Sharf in the lith ed of Firishtah. Malik Muhammad has that name in one MS, but is called Malik Ahmad in the other and Malik Mahmūd in the lith ed, and also in the lith ed of Firishtah. His father who is called Ahmad Silāh in both MSS and in the lith ed is called Ahmad Silāhdār in the lith ed of Firishtah. The name of Hīsām-ul-mulk which is found in both MSS, and in the lith ed is changed to Malik Qiyām ul-mulk and the suffix to his name is rather difficult to decipher but appears to be Handbārī. The names are not given by Col Briggs (vol IV p 200) who describes them collectively as the "Malwa officers in Ahmad Shah's camp who were at all discontented". The Cambridge History of India (p 353) refers to the chapter about Gujarāt for a detailed account of these transactions, but even there very few details are given, and there is no mention of any of the names.

Sultān Ahmad by promising them gold and *jagirs*. Owing to these acts there was a certain amount of wickedness in Sultān Ahmad's affairs and by the advice of some men who had come from the latter's camp and had joined him Sultān Mahmūd intended to make a night attack. It so happened that ¹ Qai ar Khan the instigator and bearer of Sultān Hushang informed Sultān Ahmad of this intention. So when Sultān Mahmūd's army came out from the fort they found the men in the camp ² ready and all the paths closed. In the end they pulled down a wall and the battle began. Up to the rising of the true dawn it went on furiously from both sides and a large number of men were wounded and killed. About the time of the rising of the sun Mahmud Shah retraced his steps and went into the fort of Mandu.

After some days the scouts brought the news that the inhabitants of Chanderi and the troops in that neighbourhood had rebelled against Malik ul umara Hajī Kamāl and had made Umr Khan son of Sultān Hushang their leader and to ⁴ add to the guitar of music Shahzāda Mahmud Khan son of Sultān Ahmad Gujrati was advancing towards Sarangpur with five thousand horsemen and thirty elephants. On hearing this news Sultān Mahmud held a consultation and it was decided that Āzam Humayun who was ⁵ the nursery of the empire should occupy himself in the guarding and arranging of the fort and Sultān Mahmud should himself come out of it and taking up a position in the centre of the country arrange for its protection.

¹ The name and description of this man is as I have written them in the text in the MSS as well as in the lith ed. But Firishtah lith ed has Nasir Khan the *dauatdar* of Sultān Hushang and Col Briggs (vol IV p 200) has Noosrut Khan the officer he had lately been removed from Chundery.

The word is حاضر صاحب in the MSS as well as in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has حاضر صاحب.

² The word here also حاضر in the MSS in the lith ed and also in the lith ed of Firishtah.

⁴ The words appear to be راد فی الطيور نعمة. A طيور is a kind of lute or guitar with a long neck. I do not know the meaning of the phrase but it appears to be a proverbial saying to express to add to the other difficulties. Firishtah has no analogous phrase.

⁵ The word is دوحه in the MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah but it is دوحه in the lith ed of the Tabaqat. According to the dictionary دوحه means a groove a nursery an orchard. دوحه in the text edition.

In accordance with this intention (Sultān Mahmūd) turned his face of determination in the direction of Sārangpūr, and sent Tāj Khān and Mansūr Khān in advance of himself. As Sultān Ahmad had left Malīk Hājī 'Alī at the fort of Kanbal to guard the road and keep it open, Tāj Khān and Mansūr Khān, who had arrived there before Sultān Mahmūd, fought with him. The latter fled and took the news to Sultān Ahmad, that Sultān Mahmūd had come out of the fort, and was marching towards Sārangpūr. Sultān Ahmad sent a messenger to Sārangpūr (with the direction), that the Shāhzāda should, before the arrival of Sultān Mahmūd, betake himself to Ujjain. After the arrival of the messenger Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān started from Sārangpūr, with great caution and vigilance, and came and waited upon Sultān Ahmad at Ujjain.

¹ Malīk Ishāq, the son of Qutb-ul-mulk, the feudatory of Sārangpūr sent a petition to the Sultān, and asking for pardon for his guilt, wrote that Muhammad Khān had left Sārangpūr, and had gone away to Ujjain on hearing the news of the advance, but Shāhzāda 'Umr Khān had sent an army in advance of himself with the object of seizing Sārangpūr, and was himself following behind it. On becoming acquainted with the purport of the petition Sultān Mahmūd was highly pleased, and drew the pen of pardon across the page of Malīk Ishāq's offences, and sent Tāj Khān in advance of himself to Sārangpūr and he himself also advanced in that direction. When Tāj Khān arrived at Sārangpūr, he comforted and re-assured Malīk Ishāq and all the inhabitants and leaders of the bands of Sārangpūr of the Sultān's rewards and favours. On the Sultān's arrival after they had rendered homage, the Sultān conferred the title of Daulat Khān on Malīk Ishāq and bestowed on him a standard and a ² *tās* and a gold embroidered *qabā* (robe), and ten thousand gold *tankas* in cash and doubled his stipend. He also bestowed on the heads of the different groups and the residents of the city some horses, and fifty thousand

¹ The name is ملک اسحاق in one MS and in the lith ed. It is ملک اسحاق in the other MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah. I have adopted ملک اسحاق.

² The dictionary gives cup, goblet, dish and brocade as meanings of طاس *tās*. None of these meanings appears to be appropriate.

tanhas to distribute among themselves. When he reached Sarangpur the scouts brought the news that Shahzada Umr Khan had burnt down the town Bhilsa and had arrived at the boundary of Sarangpur and that Sultan Ahmad Gujrati had also come out of Ujjain with thirty thousand horsemen and three hundred elephants and was advancing towards Sarangpur. Sultan Mahmud considered that it would be advisable to undertake the destruction of Umr Khan in the first instance and commenced an advance at the end of the night.

When there was a distance of six *larohs* between the two armies (he) sent a detachment as an advance guard and they seized some prisoners from whom a knowledge of the condition of the enemy's army could be obtained and brought them to the Sultan who made an enquiry from them of the state of Umr Khan's army. He sent Nizam ul mulk and ¹ Malik Ahmad silah and a number of others so that they might reconnoitre the jungle and the roads. He arranged the army in four detachments and advanced early in the morning to attack Umr Khan. The latter also becoming aware of Sultan Mahmud's advance hastened to meet him and having arranged his troops sent them to confront him. But he himself took up a position ² on the top of a hill and there remained in ambush waiting for an opportunity. It so happened however that some one brought the information to Sultan Mahmud that Umr Khan was hiding in ambush with some troops on the top of a hill. Sultan Mahmud with a well equipped force advanced towards him. Umr Khan said to the ³ soldiers who were with him: *It would be a reflection on their good name to fly from the son of a servant and it is better to be slain than to baulk behind.* He then fell upon Sultan Mahmud's army with the men who were united with him but was taken prisoner and was put to death by the Sultan's order. His head was placed on the top of a lance and was shown to the army of Chandori. The leaders and commanders of that army were amazed and thunder

¹ The name is Malik Ahmad silahdar in Firishtah. See note 3 on page 50 where also the name is Malik Ahmad silah in the MS and in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqat* but Ahmad silahdar in Firishtah.

Firihah lith. ed. has *بر سر کوه* in stead of *کوه* this is better but as the MSS. and the lith. ed. have I have retained it.

³ One MS. has *سنانعلی* but the other and the lith. ed. have *سنانعلی*.

struck, and sent the following message, "Please cease the ¹ battle for this day, so that early next morning, we may wait on you and render homage to you anew " On this agreement, both the armies encamped for the night (But) when night came on, the Chandēri army retired towards its own country, and when it arrived at Chandēri, the *amīns* joined together, and placed Malik Sulaimān, son of ² Malik Shēr-ul-mulk Ghūrī, who had been the *nāib* of 'Umrī Khān, giving him the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn

Sultān Mahmūd detached an army for crushing him, and advanced himself to fight with Sultān Ahmad But the two armies had not yet met each other, when some of ³ the pious men in the army of Sultān Ahmad saw His Holiness the last of the Prophet, on whom be the benediction and salutation¹, in a dream, as declaring that, "A calamity has descended from the sky, tell Sultān Ahmad, that he should carry the goods of his safety out of this country " When they informed Sultān Ahmad of this dream, he did not put much faith in it (But) within the next two or three days a pestilence appeared in his army, so that the soldiers had no time even for digging the graves Sultān Ahmad now having no alternative, went back to Gujrāt by way of Āshta, but he gave a promise to Shāhzāda Mas'ūd Khān that he would seize the country in the course of the next year, and would deliver it over to him

130/ Sultān Mahmūd then went to the fort of Maḥdū, and having, within the course of seventeen days, re-equipped his army advanced to quench the flame (of rebellion) in Chandēri When he arrived there Malik Sulaimān came out of the citadel with the *amīns*, and made brave efforts, but as they had not the requisite strength, they fled,

¹ The words *نگہ را* occur in one MS, but not in the other or in the lith ed I have inserted them as they make the meaning complete The words *موقوف* دارند are in one MS, and in the lith ed, but in the other MS they are *موقوف* دارند I consider this is better and have adopted it M Hidayat Hosain has retained *موقوف دارند* in the text edition

² Firsihtah calls him Malik Mashīr-ul-mulk who was the *nāib* and a near relative of Sultānzāda 'Umrī Khān M Hidayat Hosain has *ملک شہر ملک* in the text edition

³ Firsihtah lith ed has *صالحان*, instead of *صالحان*

and again taking shelter in the citadel fortified themselves in it But Malik Sulaiman died there quite suddenly

The *amirs* selected another to be their leader and making the necessary preparations for carrying on the warfare came out of the citadel They fought but again had to flee and take shelter in the fort When the period of the siege had extended to ¹ eight months Sultan Mahmud ² took advantage of an opportunity and ³ one night climbed over the wall of the fort and after him other brave men did so and the citadel was seized and a large number became food for the sword But one party fled and ⁴ fortified themselves in a fort which was situated on the top of a hill After some days Isma'il Khan (of) Kalpi obtained quarter and brought them down from the fort Sultan Mahmud having arranged the affairs of that territory in the best way and having allotted Chanderi as a *jagir* to Malik Muzaffar Ibrahim intended to return But his scouts brought the news that Dungar Sen had come from the fort of ⁵ Gwalior and had besieged the ⁶ city of Narwar In spite of the fact that his army

¹ The period is eight months in both MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah and in Col Briggs (vol IV p 204) It is seven months in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* and in the Cambridge History of India

The word is *انظار* in one MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah It is *اندهاى* in the other MS and in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* The dictionary meaning of *اندهاى* is act of rising getting up another word *اندهار* means watching for finding an opportunity I think *اندهار* is more appropriate than *انظار* or *اندهاى* and this is adopted by M. Hidayat Hosain in the text edition

³ One MS has *نسن* instead of *سى* This appears to be a mistake

⁴ There are some variations in the readings One MS and the lith ed have *سدين سدين* the other has *مدين مدين* and further on one MS and the lith ed have *امان گوفه* while the other has *امان گوفه* I have accepted *سدين سدين* As to the other difference there is apparently not much to choose I have adopted the readings of the first MS and the lith ed In the text edition M. Hidayat Hosain has *ان حواء* instead of *ان حواء* Firishtah gives the conditions on which quarter was granted

⁵ Gwalior is spelt *گوالر* in both MSS and in the lith ed but on previous occasions it was spelt *گوالر* and is so spelt here also in Firishtah

⁶ The name is *سهر نور* the new city in one MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah It is *سهر نور* the city of Narwar in the other MS and *سهر نور* the city of Nur or

was, owing to its being the rainy season and the long period of the siege, ¹ in much distress, Mahmūd Shāh advanced towards Gwāliar by successive rapid marches. When leaving his own territory, he arrived near Gwāliar, he commenced to plunder and ravage the country. A body of Rājputs came out of the fort, and engaged in a battle, but as they had not the strength to withstand the assaults of Mahmūd Shāh's army they fled, and entered into the ² aperture of the fort. Dūngar Sēn on hearing this news decided on a retreat and raised the siege, and fled to Gwāliar. As Mahmūd's object was to release Narwar from the siege, he did not occupy himself with besieging Gwāliar and returned to Shādīābād.

✧ In the year 843 A H, (1439 A D), he commenced the election of the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and the completion of the *Jāma' Masjid* of Hūshang Shāh, which is situated near the ³ Rām Sarāi gate, and

Naur in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*, though later on, it is شهر نور in it also. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 205) has Nurwui. The Cambridge History of India, page 354, has "a town named Shahr-i-Nau, not now traceable". The evidence in support of the reading *Shahr-i-Nau* appears to be good, but I think شهر نور or the city of Narwar is the correct reading. Narwar is situated on the river Sind opposite to Jhānsī, and would be on the way from Gwāliar. The Cambridge History of India (p 354) calls Dūngar Sēn "Dongar Singh the Tonwār of Gwalior". The name is Dūngar Sēn in the MSS and in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* and also in the lith ed of *Firishtah*, but Col Briggs has Dongar Sing. After Timūr's invasion, Gwalior according to the Cambridge History of India, page 241, was held by the Tonwar Rājputs, but the name of Tonwar does not appear in the list of the Rajpoot royal races given on page 63 of Tod's *Rajasthan*, vol I, the nearest approach to that name being the Tuars, which appears in the lists by the Khēechie Bard and by the author (Col Tod). It is true that the Imperial Gazetteer of India, vol XII, page 441, agrees with the Cambridge History of India in saying that "After Timūr's invasion Gwalior was seized by the Tonwar Rajputs". But Tonwar is spelt there as it indeed is on page 241 of the Cambridge History with the short a and not with the long a as on page 354. M. Hidayat Hosain has شهر نور in the text edition.

¹ The MSS have بر دسان, and the lith ed has که بر دسان. *Firishtah* lith ed has بر دسان. This appears to be the correct reading and I have accepted it.

² The MSS and the lith ed and the lith ed of *Firishtah* all have سوارج قلعه در آمدند.

³ The name of the gate is variously given. One MS has درواره رام سرای, Rām Sarāi gate. Another has what looks like درواره هاراسوی the Hārāsūi gate,

had two hundred and thirty cupolas and three hundred and eighty¹ pillars (minarets?) and these were completed in a short time

✕ In the year 845 A H petitions from the *amirs* of Mewat and the great and holy men of the metropolitan city of Delhi came in rapid succession to the effect that Sultan Muhammad (son of Mubarak Shah) was unable properly to discharge the high and onerous duties of sovereignty and consequently the hands of the oppressors and of turbulent men had come out of the sleeve of tyranny and oppression and there was nothing left of peace and quietness except in name and a story. As the tailor of faith and providence had sewn the robe of sovereignty on the elegant stature of that asylum of sovereignty the generality of the residents of this country wish that they should place the collar of allegiance to him on their neck of submission and subjection with willingness and alacrity. In the latter part of the year Sultan Mahmud advanced towards Delhi with a well equipped army. In the neighbourhood of the town of Hindaun Yusuf Khan Hindustani waited on him. When he encamped in the village of² Panna Sultan Ahmad took up a position with Tughlaqabad at his rear. The

while the lith ed : درواره رامپوری Firishtah lith ed ha. درواره راموی and Col Briggs (vol I v p 00) has the Rampoor gate

¹ The MSS u i t) lith ed have استوانه which according to the dictionary means a cylinder. Fl lith ed ha ستون a pillar. The mosque according to Firishtah lith ed ha two hundred and eight *iwanas* and according to Col Briggs (vol I v p 00) two hundred and thirty minarets and two hundred and sixty arches

The MSS as well as the lith ed have 840 A H but Firishtah lith ed has 844 A H and C I Brigg has 844 A H 1440 A D. The Cambridge History of India page 34 al ha 1440 A D. For an account of these transactions as given in the history of Sultan Muhammad Shah of Delhi see page 71 of vol I Persian text and pages 3738 of vol I English translation of this work. The Delhi Sultan here called Sultan Mahmud Mubarak Shah in one MS and in the lith ed and Sultan Muhammad Mubarak Shah in the other MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah though in the Delhi section he was called Sultan Muhammad Shah. He was the adopted son of Mubarak Shah and the correct reading here should be Muhammad Shah son of Mubarak Shah. The Cambridge History of India page 304 calls him Sayyid Muhammad Shah

² One MS has بده Panna while the other has what looks like بده Tabta while the lith ed has بده Patna

next day Sultān Mahmūd divided his army into three detachments. He placed two of them under the commands of Sultān Gḥiyāth-ud-dīn, and of ¹ Ghaznīn Khān who had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and sent them against Sultān Muhammad's army and kept the third force of selected soldiers with himself. ² Sultān Muhammad sent out Malik Bahlūl Lūdī and Saiyid Khān and Daiyā Khān and Quṭb Khān and other commanders, and engaged them in battle. Up to nightfall, brave men experienced in warfare stepped out from both sides and gave proofs of their courage and bravery. In the end both parties sounded the drum of retreat and took up their positions in their original stations.

✶ ³ It so happened that on that very night Sultān Mahmūd saw in a dream, that some audacious low men had risen in revolt in the fort of Mandū, and had brought the royal umbrella from the tomb of Sultān Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a man of obscure descent. In the morning there were signs of anxiety and ⁴ distress in him. At this time Sultān Muhammad sent emissaries, and struck at the door of peace. Sultān Mahmūd immediately agreed to a pacific settlement, and started on the journey back to Mālwa. On the way, news came to him, that as it had happened, on that very night a mob of the common people had raised the dust of disorder and disturbance in Mandū, but it had been quelled by the exertions and

¹ He is called Qadm Khān in one MS and Ghaznīn Khān in the other and Nasrat Khān in the lith ed. Qadm Khān seems to be the correct reading, see note 4, page 327, vol I, English translation of this work, and I have adopted it.

² One MS has by mistake Sultān Mahmūd.

³ Firishtah agrees mainly as to the three versions of the reason of Sultān Mahmūd's return to Mālwa, though the lith ed says that he saw the revolt in the fort of Mandū in an واقعه, happening and not in a dream. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 206) says that he saw it in a dream. But the Cambridge History of India, page 354, says that Mahmūd readily accepted Muhammad Shāh's proposed terms of peace, as he "had learnt that during his absence the mob had risen in Māndū, removed the gilded umbrella from the tomb of Hūshang, and raised it over the head of a pretender." It has thus converted what Sultān Mahmūd saw in a dream into a series of actual events.

⁴ The MSS have ویدرگی and و سمرگی after نورد while the lith ed has no similar words. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has و سمرگی, and I have adopted it. M Hidayat Hosain has و سمردگی in the text edition.

management of Āzam Humayun. It has however come under my notice that it appears in some history that news was conveyed to Sultān Mahmud that Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī was about to invade Malwa and for this reason Sultān Mahmud came back. This version appears to be the most correct.

➤ In short Sultān Mahmud arrived in Shadīabad on the 1st of Muharram 846 A.H. and made the deserving men there partake of his gifts and benefactions. In the same year he laid out a garden in the land appertaining to the town of Nalcha and built a dome and a few great palaces in it and remained for some time in Shadīabad.

~ After a short time he repaired the casualties and the damages sustained by his army and marched out towards Chitor with the determination of chastising the Rajputs. ³ At this time ⁴ news was brought to the Sultān of the arrogance of Naṣir ⁵ son of Abd ul Qadir the governor of Kalpi who had assumed the title of Naṣir Shah and had declared his independence and letters had come from both the great men and the ordinary inhabitants of the country that he had placed his foot outside the straight and strong path of the law of the Prophet and was struggling on the path of heresy and oppression and (they) were crying for justice from his oppression and tyranny. Sultān Mahmud placed the destruction of Naṣir Shah in the forefront of his energies and ⁶ advanced towards Kalpi.

¹ The name of the month is left out in the MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah but is given as Muharram in the lith ed of the Tabaqat. Of course the first day of Muharram is also the first day of the year. The year is 846 A.H. in the MSS and in the lith ed but is 845 A.H. in the lith ed of Firishtah and 845 A.H. 1441 A.D. in Col Briggs (vol IV p 207).

² One MS has *و بعد از آنکه ب و ریتک لسكر حرد را درس کرد* in stead of what I have in the text which is the reading of the other MSS and the lith ed.

³ The sentence is long and rather clumsily worded.

⁴ The word *خبر* is omitted in one MS and in the lith ed.

⁵ The word *و اد* after *نصر* is omitted in the MSS and the text edition. It is in the lith ed of Firishtah and as it is required to make sense I have inserted it.

⁶ One MS has instead *عالم گالی گسب* which occurs in the other and in the lith ed and in the lith ed of Firishtah by mistake *مروحه سواد اعظم* همانوں گالی گسب.

† Naṣīr ¹ (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir, having received information of the advance of Sultān Mahmūd, sent ² ‘Alī Khān, his uncle, with many beautiful things and presents and various kinds of tributes, and submitted a representation to the effect, that “Whatever they have said in respect of me, is entirely false and a fabrication, and in order to decide this matter, if you will send truthful men and will find out the truth, you can mete out any punishment that I may deserve if even a small part of it be proved to be true.” Sultān Mahmūd ³ did not grant an audience to the emissary for some days and advanced stage after stage. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of Sārangpūr, he, at the suggestion of Āzam Humāyūn and other chief men of the state, drew the pen of forgiveness across the ⁴ page of Naṣīr’s offences, granted permission to his emissary to make his *lūnmish*, accepted his tribute, and sending him letters containing counsel and precepts gave permission to ‘Alī Khān to go back, and turned towards the country of Chitōr.

✓ When he crossed the ⁵ river of Bhīm, he sent detachments every day in different directions in the country of Chitōr and devastated it and plundered and took the people prisoners, and pulling down idol temples, laid the foundations of mosques. He halted for three or four days at each stage. When he encamped at Kōnbhalmīr, which is one of the greatest forts of that country, and is famous for its strength in the whole country of ⁶ Hindūstān, there the *vakīl* of Rāy Kōnbhā, who was named Dēbā, fortified himself, and sent out troops

¹ Here also the man is named *امير عبد القادر* and the word *ولد* or *بن* is omitted in the MSS, the lith. ed., and the text edition.

² One MS. has *علي حان* instead of *علي حان*. Firishtah calls him Naṣīr Khān’s *معلم* or tutor and not his uncle.

³ One MS. has *بار دادة* instead of *بار ديدة*.

⁴ The word *صعكة* is only in one MS. before *تقميرات*, but I have inserted it, as it is required to make the metaphor complete.

⁵ Both the MSS. and the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call it the *اب نهيم*. There was a *حوض نهيم* mentioned before, see page 481, but it cannot be identical with *اب نهيم*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208) calls it the Bunas river.

⁶ Both MSS. have *اراسا*, but the lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah have *دراسا*. This is better, and I have adopted it. It would appear that according to the *Tabaqāt* and Firishtah it was the fort of Kōnbhalmīr itself that Dēbā Rāy fortified himself in, but according to Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 208)

to carry on skirmishes. It so happened that they had built a grand temple opposite to the fort and had drawn a line of fortifications round it and had stored provisions and war materials in it. Sultan Mahmud directed his energies to the capture of the fortifications round the temple and seized them in the course of a week. A large number of Rajputs became food for the sword and others were plundered and taken prisoners. Sultan Mahmud ordered that the buildings appertaining to the temple should be filled with firewood and set on fire and he poured ¹ water and vinegar over the walls and in the twinkling of an eye those grand edifices which had taken so many years to erect were rent asunder and crumbled down. The idols were also broken up and given to the butchers (Col Briggs adds of the camp) so that they might use them as weights for their scales for the sale of meat. The largest idol which had been fashioned in the shape of a ² sheep was converted into lime and given with the

it was one of the forts in the Koombulmere district. And he calls its defendant Beny Ray. The Cambridge History of India page 355 is delightfully vague here and says he captured a fort and destroyed a temple and advanced to Chitor. It is curious that there is no mention of these incidents in Tod's *Rajasthan*. On the other hand Tod (vol I p 299) says that in S 1436 A D (1440 A D) the kings of Malwa and Guzerat at the head of powerful armies invaded Mewar. Koombho met them on the plains of Malwa bordering on his own state and at the head of one hundred thousand horse and foot and fourteen hundred elephants gave them an entire defeat carrying captive to Chetore Mahmood the Khilji sovereign of Malwa. We have no mention of this victory in either the Tabaqat or in Firishtah but according to Col Tod Abul Fuzil mentions it and dilates on Koombho's greatness of soul in setting his enemy at liberty not only without ransom but with gifts. Col Tod also says that Mahmood was confined for six months in Chetore that Rana Sang's son gave Baber the crown of the Malwa king one of the trophies of the conquest and finally that there is a more durable record of the victory in the inscription on the triumphal pillar of Chetore of which Koombho laid the foundation eleven years after the event and which was completed in ten years.

¹ One MS and the lith ed have آب و سرکه while the other MS has آب سرکه but Firishtah lith ed has آب سرد. He however agrees with the Tabaqat in saying that water was poured over the wall but Col Briggs says that cold water was thrown on the stone images.

Col Briggs (vol IV page 209 footnote) says probably the figure was one of a bull for as he says there is no other instance of the image of a sheep or a ram being treated as an object of worship by the Hindus.

pān leaf to the Rājapūts, so that they should have to eat of the object of their worship

After he had done all this, he turned the bridle of his determination towards Chitōr, and after his arrival in that quarter, he seized, after some fighting, a fort, which was situated at the foot of the Chitōr hill, and slew a number of Rājapūts there. He was, after this, engaged in preparations for the siege of Chitōr, when the scouts brought the news, that Kōnbhā himself was not in the fort, but had on that day come out of it, and had gone away in the direction of the foot hills, which were situated in that neighbourhood. The Sultān started in pursuit of him and sent several detachments separately in different directions after him. It so happened, that one of these encountered Kōnbhā, and a great battle took place, in which Kōnbhā was defeated, and entered the fort of Chitōr. Sultān Mahmūd detached one army to besiege the fort, and himself took up a position in the centre of the country, and sent detachments every day for ravaging, and laying the country waste.

He then summoned Ā'zam Humāyūn Khān Jahān, so that he might take possession of ¹ the country belonging to the Rājapūts, which was situated round about Shādiābād. When Ā'zam Humāyūn arrived at Mandisōr, he fell ill, and surrendered the deposit of life Sultān Mahmūd on receiving this news became extremely disconsolate and sorrowful. He wept much, and in his great grief and distress wounded his face. On arrival in the fort of Mandisōr, he sent the body of his father to Shādiābād, and made Tāj Khān, who was the pay-master of the army, its commander, and returned to his own camp.

As the rainy season had now arrived, the Sultān resolved, that he should select an elevated position, and take up his quarters there, and after the end of the rains again go on with the siege of Chitōr. On the night of the 25th of Dhī-hijjah, 846 A H (April 24th, 1443 A D)

¹ The MSS and the lith ed agree, but Firishtah says *تا ولایت جیتور را* *که در اطراف مدد سور واقع است مأمور شود*, so that he might occupy the part of the country of Jaitōr, which was situated around Mandisōr. The Cambridge History of India (p 355) does not say that Sultān Mahmūd asked his father to occupy the country round Mandisor, but that the latter led an expedition against that place, and there fell ill and died.

Kōnbha made a night attack with ten thousand cavalry and six thousand infantry but Sultān Mahmūd had arranged for the protection of his camp with such care and vigilance that he was unable to do anything and a large number of ¹ Rajputs were slain. The next night Sultān Mahmūd made a night attack on the army of Kōnbha with an army in battle array. Kōnbha was wounded and fled towards Chitor and many Rajputs became food for the sword and much booty fell into the hands of - the followers of Mahmūd. The latter carried out the rites of offering thanks to God and deferring the capture of the fort of Chitor to the next year returned to his capital of Shadīabad for protection and safety.

Towards the end of Dhī ḥijjah of the same year he planned the erection of a college and a minaret ² seven stories high in front of the Hushang Shāhī Jama Mosque.

In the year ⁴ 849 A H an ambassador came from Sultān Mahmūd ✕ son of Sultan Ibrahim Sharqī the ruler of Jaunpur with gifts and presents of rare excellence and after placing them before the Sultān gave a verbal message to the following effect. Nasir ⁵ son of Abd ul qadir the governor of Kalpi has turned his face from the strict path of the law of the Prophet has adopted the ways of heresy and heterodoxy has given up the practice of fasting and prayer and has made over Musalman women to Hindu *Nayikas* so that they might teach them the art of dancing. As the governors of Kalpi have from the time of Sultān Hushang been nominees of the rulers of Malwa it is right and proper that I should in the first instance reveal all

¹ One MS and the lith ed have راجپوت بشار but the other MS has راجپوتان بشار

² One MS and the lith ed have بدست و در آن ردای, but the other MS has بدست لسكر سلطان محمود

³ The words are منار هفت منظر. Col Briggs (vol IV p 10) has translated it a beautiful pillar seven stories high. I have found that the dictionary gives face aspect a lofty building tower and palace among the meanings of منظر but none of these is quite appropriate. M Hidayat Hosain has منارة instead of منار in the text edition.

⁴ The MSS and the lith ed all have 849 A H but Firishtah and Col Briggs have 847 A H and Col Briggs (vol IV p 210) has 1444 A D.

⁵ One MS omits the word ن

his circumstances to your right-thinking mind, but if you should not have the leisure to punish and chastise him, you may indicate the fact to me, so that I may chastise him in a way, that may be deterrent to others ” Sultān Mahmūd said in reply, “ The greater part of my army has gone to punish the rebels of ¹ Mandisōi, and as you have placed the defence of the faith in the forefront of your energies, ² may your undertaking be of good omen, and it has my approval ” In the same *maḡlis* he bestowed a robe of honour, and the usual money, which had become customary in that age and which had been paid to ambassadors, on the ambassador of Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, and granted him permission to return

† When the ambassador arrived at Jaunpūr, and reported (Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī’s) reply, Sultān Mahmūd, on account of his great pleasure and joy, sent twenty elephants as a final present to the Sultān He then advanced towards Kālpī with a well-equipped army, and ³ expelled Naṣir (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir from that country

✕ And Naṣir (son of) ‘Abd-ul-qādir sent a petition to Mahmūd Shāh to the following purport, “ I have been obedient and submissive to your well wishers from the time of Hūshang Shāh to this day Now Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī has, with violence and tyranny, seized this *faqīr*’s territory As you have always been my protector, now also knowing your high threshold to be the altar of my hopes, I have turned (my face) towards the country of Chandēri ” Sultān Mahmūd sent ‘Alī Khān with elegant things and presents to Sultān Mahmūd

¹ The MSS have میوات , and سواد , and the lith ed has منوات which all appear to be incorrect The lith ed of Frishtah has مدسور , and I have adopted it M Hidayat Hosain, however, has retained سواد in the text edition

² There is some difficulty about the meaning of the passage, which is written in one MS as مبارک باشد که قصد مقبول نموده اند In the other MS the word و is substituted for که , and the word است for the last two words اند نموده In the lith ed the conjunction is و and the sentence ends with the words مقبول , and both اند نموده and است are omitted

³ The expression in the MSS and in the lith ed as well as in the lith ed of Frishtah is حواحه دار اران دیار سرون کرد I cannot find out the exact meaning of the word حواحه دار It would be noticed that it was used in two previous passages

Sharqī and begged him that As Nasir Khan son of Abd ul qadir has through your exertions and activities repented of his evil acts and has adopted the path of the law of the Prophet and as he has from the time of the fortunate Sultan Hushang been under our protection it is hoped that accepting and taking into consideration the purport of the text that one who has repented of his sin is as if he had not sinned at all he would draw the pen of forgiveness over his offences and would deliver his country back to him After the arrival of Ali Khan Sultan Mahmud Sharqī did not give any distinct reply and passed the time by saying may be and perhaps

2 Mahmud Shah Khalji owing to his sense of honour and manliness considered the protection of Nasir (son of) Abd ul qadir incumbent on his spirits and started on the 12nd Shawwal 848 towards Chanderi and in the neighbourhood of that place - Nasir Khan came and rendered him 3 homage and 4 (Sultan Mahmud then) immediately advanced towards Erij and Bhandir When this news reached Sultan Mahmud Sharqī he came out of the city and encamped in the territory of Erij and having seized Mubarak Khan son of Junaid Khan who was the hereditary ruler of that place took him along with him Starting from that place he encamped in the broken ground near the river Jamuna to which there was only a narrow

1 The corresponding A.D. date is given by Col Briggs (vol IV p. 1) as January 8th 1440 A.D. while the Cambridge History of India page 35 gives January 1st 1440 as the date on which Sultan Mahmud Khalji commenced his march towards Chanderi

He is called Nasir Shah in this place in the MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah but more correctly Nasir Khan in the lith ed of the Tabaqat M. Hidayat Hosain has Nasir Shah in the text-edition

2 The words ملازم گرد occur in one MS after ملازم نمود but not in the other MS or in the lith ed

3 The words from بلا خوف to چون occur in the MS but are omitted from the lith ed There are slight differences in the MS also the initial و is omitted in one and the name of the second place is differently spelt in the two MSS In one it is بهاندیر which I suppose is Bhāndir though there is no dot below the first letter while in the other it is written as بهدر which is probably Bhadnir In the lith ed of Firishtah it is بهاندیر Thāndir Col Briggs (vol IV p. 212) has Bhandero The Cambridge History of India mentions Erij but not Bhandir

passage, and where a hostile army could not come up to him, and strengthened the position by the erection of works round it. Mahmūd Shāh leaving him alone there advanced towards Kālpi, and Mahmūd Shāh Sharqī becoming impatient also marched towards that place. At this time the warriors of the Khaljī army attacked his base, and took an immense quantity of booty. Upon this he turned round with a body of his men, and engaged in a battle, and the fight and slaughter continued till the evening. After the lord of the stars (the sun) had set, the two armies returned to their original stations, and remained there. After two or three days, as the rainy season had already made its approach, Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī returned to Fathābād after plundering and ravaging some villages appertaining to Kālpi. He planned the erection there of a palace seven stories high.

7 The *ra'iyats* and inhabitants of the town of Erij complained of the oppression and tyranny of Mubtāk Khān, son of Junaid Khān. Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī sent Malik-ush-sharq Muzaffar Ibrāhīm, the governor of Chandūrī, with a large army to Erij. When he arrived in the neighbourhood, news came that Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī had sent Malik Kālū to attack and destroy him, and had reached the village of ¹ Rātah. Malik Muzaffar Ibrāhīm also turned to Rātah and after they had met Malik Kālū fled. The inhabitants of Rātah came and saw Muzaffar Ibrāhīm. ² he seized them all, and sent them to Chandūrī, and again advanced towards Erij. He learnt on the way that Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī had sent the major portion of his army to make a raid on the territory of ³ Barhūr, the Rāv whereof was a dependant of Mahmūd Shāh Khaljī. Malik Muzaffar considered the guarding of his (master's) dominions must have precedence over the conquest of Erij, and advanced in that direction. and the Sharqī army, hearing

¹ The name is written as رات and رات in the MS. and رات in the lith ed., and in the lith ed. of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 213) calls it Rohut. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place, or the incidents connected with it.

² It is not at all clear why he did so. *Firishtah* does not mention the incident.

³ The place is called Barhūr in one MS. and in the lith ed., and رباد Parbād in the other MS. It is not mentioned in the lith ed. of *Firishtah*. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted رهاره Parhūrah in the text edition.

the news turned back and went to the town of Ratah. As the war was being prolonged and Muslims belonging to both sides were being wounded and slain ¹ Shaikh Jalalud-din who was one of the great men of the age and was famous for revelations and miraculous acts wrote and sent with the concurrence of Sultan Mahmud Sharqi a letter to Mahmud Shah Khalji on the subject of a peace and by the exertions of His Holiness the Shaikh the peace was effected in this way that Sultan Mahmud Sharqi should at once make over the towns of Ratah and Mahobah to Nasir Khan and when four months should have elapsed after the return of Mahmud Shah Khalji he should deliver to him the territory of Kalpi also. The period of four months was mentioned for this reason that in that time the truth about his religion and creed would be disclosed and on this agreement Mahmud Shah Khalji returned to Shadabad.

In the year 848 A.H. the Sultan planned the establishment of a ² hospital and he created an endowment by the gift of some villages for paying the charges of medicines and all the other things required for the sick. He also appointed Maulana Fadl ul lah *hakim* (physician) who had the title of *Malik ul hukama* for observing the condition of the ³ sick and the insane.

On the ⁴ 20th of Rajab ul murajjab in the year 950 A.H. (Sultan Mahmud) advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Mandalgarh.

¹ The name is written as *حالدة* and *حائدة* in the MS and as *حالدة* in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* and *حائدة* in the lith ed of *Firishtah*. Col Briggs (vol IV page 13) calls him Sheikh Chand of Malwa.

² *Firishtah* lith ed gives 849 A.H. as the year of the foundation of the hospital. Col Briggs (vol IV p 214) gives 1440 A.D. as the corresponding year of the Christian era.

³ This is one of the earliest mentions of the establishment of a hospital and it certainly as far as I know is the earliest mention of a hospital for mental diseases. Col Briggs (vol IV page 14) gives a description of the hospital and mentions apartments for maniacs but the Cambridge History of India page 36 only incidentally mentions the building of the hospital.

⁴ The MSS are incorrect here. One has *مرض وحادن* and the other *مرض و محاسن*. The lith eds of both the *Tabaqat* and of *Firishtah* have the correct reading.

⁵ Col Briggs (vol IV p 214) gives September 11th 1446 A.D. as the corresponding date. The Cambridge History of India page 36 says Mahmud Khalji invaded the Rana's dominion in October 1446 A.D.

When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Ranthambhōr, he transferred the command of it from Bahār Khān to Malik Saif-ud-dīn, and marching by successive stages encamped on the bank of the river Benāres. As Rāy Kōnbhā did not possess the strength to meet him, he fortified himself in the fort of Mandalgarh, and on the 2nd and 3rd day, the Rājputs sallied out of the fort, and exerted themselves bravely. But in the end, they came in with weakness and humility, and agreed to pay tribute. Sultān Khālji, owing to the exigencies of the time, agreed to a peace, and returned (to his own dominions).

In a short time, having newly equipped his army, he advanced with the object of capturing the fort of Bījāna. When he arrived within two *farsangs* of that place, ¹ Saiyid Muhammad Khān, the governor of the place, sent his son Aūhad Khān to wait on him, and sent one hundred horses, and one *lakh* of *tanlas* in cash as tribute. Mahmūd Shāh having honoured him with a special robe of honour, gave him permission to go back. He also sent a gold embroidered *qabā* (robe) and a head-dress decorated with gems, a gold belt and horses with saddles and bridles adorned with gold for Muhammad Khān himself. The latter put on the *qabā*, and opened his mouth in praise of Mahmūd Shāh, and had the public prayer read and the coins struck ² in his name. The Sultān on hearing this news returned from the place where he was. On the way he captured the town of ³ Alhanpūr which is situated near Ranthambhōr. He next ⁴ sent eight thousand

¹ He is called Mahmūd Khān in one MS. In the other he is called Mahmūd Khān in one place and Muhammad Khān in the other. The lith. ed. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah call him Muhammad Khān.

² It appears from Firishtah that he did so by removing the name of the *Bādshāh* of Dehlī. The Cambridge History of India, page 356, says Muhammad Khān substituted the name of Mahmūd Khālji for that of 'Ālam Shāh of Dehlī. As a matter of fact, the Sultān of Dehlī at this time was Sultān 'Ālā ud-dīn, who was succeeded by Bahlūl Lūdī, and no 'Ālam Shāh reigned in Dehlī at that time.

³ The name of the town is variously given. The MSS. have آلھنپور Alhanpūr, and the lith. ed. has پہتور Pahtūr, while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has نور Nēwar. Col. Briggs has the *fort* (not the *town*) of Anundpoor, and the Cambridge History of India, page 356, cuts the Gordian knot by calling it "a minor fortress."

⁴ Under Tāj Khān, according to Firishtah, Col. Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.

horsemen and twenty five elephants with the object of capturing the fort of Chitor and after taking one *lakh* and five and twenty thousand *tankas* from the Raja of Kotah in the way of tribute returned to Shadiabad

In the year 854 A H 1450 A D ¹ Gangdas the Raja of the fort of Champanir sent him tribute and submitted that Sultān Muhammad son of Sultān Ahmad is besieging the hill of Chāmpanir as this slave has always carried his prayers to Your Majesty he now hopes for aid and support Sultān Mahmūd turned his attention to give him help On the way news came that ² Sultān Qutb ud din son of Sultān Muhammad Gujrati had come towards Idar with the object of demanding tribute from the Raja of that place Sultān Mahmud considering him to be ³ weak started towards ⁴ Barasinor On hearing this news Sultān Muhammad as his ⁵ baggage animals had become lame and disabled burnt his tents and other equipages

¹ He is called گنگ داس *gangdas* or کنگ داس *kankdas* in the MSS and in the lith ed and the lith ed of Firsihtah Col Briggs (vol IV p 215) calls him Gungadas The Cambridge History of India which on page 301 in the chapter about the history of Gujarat had Gang dā calls him here on page 306 Kanak Dās

² He is called Sultān Qutb ud din Muhammad Gujrati in one MS and in the lith ed but the other MS has Sultān Qutb ud din son of Sultān Muhammad Gujrati Firsihtah lith ed has Sultān Muhammad Shah Gujrati Sultān Muhammad Shah died soon after the invasion of Sultān Mahmud Khalji and Sultān Qutb ud din succeeded him This is probably the reason of the confusion in the names of the Sultān

³ There is some difference in the readings here One MS has what looks like حرور The other has حرودمه It is omitted in the lith ed Firsihtah has عارو It is rather far fetched but the reading may be عارو in the text the عا having been omitted by some scribe In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has دانسد ان حرورام which seems more appropriate

⁴ The name is ناراسنور in one MS and نار اسنور in the other and in the lith ed Firsihtah lith ed has what looks like مار اسنور Neither Col Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions this place M Hidayat Hosain has ناراسنور in the text edition

⁵ The MSS and the lith ed have حاروای ناری Firsihtah in the corresponding passage has حارواغای ناری This appears to me to be correct and I have adopted it M Hidayat Hosain has حارواغا ناری in the text edition

and retired towards Ahmadābād. When Sultān Mahmūd received this information, he also turned back from the way, and encamped on the bank of the Mahindī. Gangdās came to him at this place, bringing with him thirteen *lakhs* of *tankas* in cash, and some horses in the way of tribute. Sultān Mahmūd bestowed on him a gold embroidered robe (*qabā*) in the same *maglis*, and gave him permission to go back, and himself returned to his capital of Shādīābād. On the way, he gave permission to Rāy Bī, Rāja of Īdar, to go back, after bestowing on him, as a reward, five elephants and twenty-one horses and three *lakhs* of *tankas* in cash. He remained for a time at Shādīābād and occupied himself with the affairs of his dominions and army.

In the year 855 A H, (1451 A D), he advanced with more than one hundred thousand horses to conquer Gujāt and having passed ¹ Ghātī Bawālī, besieged the town of Sultānpūr. Malik 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhīāb, who was the deputy of ² Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn for some days sallied out of the fort and fought bravely. (But) when he ³ became hopeless of receiving any reinforcement he begged for quarter and joined Sultān Mahmūd. The latter sent his family and ⁴ children to the fort of Mandū, and made him swear that he would never turn his face from his master. He then gave him the title of Mubārīz Kḥān, and made him the commander of the army, and advanced towards Ahmadābād. On the way news came that ⁵ Sultān Muhammad had surrendered the deposit of his life, and his son Qutb-ud-dīn had taken his place. Sultān Mahmūd, in spite of the fact that his object was the destruction of the mansion of Sultān Muhammad's government, owing to his great humanity, assumed

¹ The name is written as گهالی نوالی, and گهانی نوالی in the MSS, and as گانی نوالی in the lith ed. Firsihtah lith ed has گانی نوالی. I have not been able to find the name elsewhere. M Hidayat Hosain has adopted گهاتی نوالی in the text edition.

² But see below where it will be seen that Sultān Muhammad was yet alive.

³ شد in one MS, and in the lith ed, but گشت in the other MS.

⁴ عیال او اطعالت را in one MS, and in the lith ed, and عیال او اطعالت را in the other MS.

⁵ One MS inserts سلطان محمد بن سادات احمد, while the other quite erroneously substitutes سلطان محمد for سلطان احمد.

mourning and in accordance with a custom of the time distributed *pan* and *Sharbat* (betel and sweet drinks) to the *amirs* and learned men in his army. He also wrote a letter to Sultān Qutb ud din offering him condolences on his father's death and congratulations on his accession. At the same time however he laid waste the town of Barōda and left no stone unturned in the matter of plundering and seizing the inhabitants. He made prisoners of some thousands of Musalmans and *Kafirs* and after halting for some days in that town advanced towards Ahmadabad.

At this time Malik Ala ud din Suhrah who had been waiting for a time and opportunity fled and went to Sultān Qutb ud din.¹ It would appear that when he took the oath and engaged that he would not be false to the salt of his master he had his old (original) master in his mind and owing to his great regard for his salt had abandoned his family and children. Sultān Mahmud marched by successive stages and encamped at - Kaparbaj which was situated at a distance of 25 *karohs* from Ahmadabad. Sultān Qutb ud din halted at the village of Khanpur which was three *karohs* from Kaparbaj. For some days the two *Badshahs* confronted each other and on the night of² the last day of Safar in the afore mentioned year Sultān Mahmud mounted his horse with the determination of making a night attack and came out of his camp. But he misad the way and remained all night seated on his horse in an open plain. Early in the morning he placed the army of Sarangpur on his right wing and entrusted the command of it to his eldest son Qutb ud din and nominated the *amirs* of Chanderi to the left wing and arrayed it under the command of⁴ Qadam Khan who was his younger son.

¹ There are differences in the readings here. The MSS have with slight variations the reading I have adopted. The lith. ed. has a very imperfect reading

سركج Sarkaj in the text edition

² The date is *سفر* in the MSS and in the lith. ed. both of the *Tal'iq* and *Farishtah* *سفر* as applied to a month mean toward the close of and in respect of a particular day means the last day. Col Briggs (vol IV p 21) gives the 1st of Suffur 86 as the date of the proposed night attack and gives the 10th of February 143 as the corresponding date of the Christian era. Both the date and the year of the *Hijri* era and consequently the date and the year of the Christian era are incorrect.

⁴ *عربس حل* in the text edition

He placed himself in the centre of the army and commenced the battle. Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn also placing the army of Gujrāt in battle array advanced to the (battle-) field. The vanguard of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn's army fled before the vanguard of Sultān Mahmūd's army, and joined Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn. Muzaflar Khān, who was one of the great *amīns* of Chanderī, separated himself from the left wing of Sultān Mahmūd's army, and attacked the right wing of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn's army, and its soldiers being unable to withstand the attack turned their faces in flight. Muzaflar Khān pursued them as far as Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn's camp, and his men stretching their hands to plunder and ravage entered the treasury in the camp, and loading all their elephants with treasure sent them at once to their own camp. When the elephants returned, and they wanted to load and send them a second time, they heard that a detachment of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn's army finding Shāhzāda ¹ Qadam Khān's troops to be weak and in distress had attacked them, and as they were unable to withstand them, they carried away their lives ² on one foot (i.e., with much difficulty). Muzaflar Khān withdrawing his hand from plunder went into a corner. Sultān Mahmūd was amazed at seeing his army dispersed and his left wing routed, and stood with two hundred horsemen on the field of bravery, and acting as an expert archer, as long as he had any arrows left in his quiver, gave proof of his great courage. At this time Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn came out of the corner, in which he was concealed, with a detachment in battle array and confronted Sultān Mahmūd. The latter having exerted himself to the utmost retired to his camp, with (only) thirteen men. Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn considered this victory a great gift of God, and did not engage in pursuit. Eighty-one elephants and an immense quantity of booty fell into his hands.

Sultān Mahmūd remained on horseback in his place till nightfall. When five or six thousand horsemen had collected round him, he started for Mandū at midnight. On the way, his army was badly harassed by *kōlīs* and *bhīls*. Sultān Mahmūd did not, from the time of the rising of the sun of his greatness and up to the end of the period

¹ قدی خان in the text edition

² The MSS have تنک با and تنک با, and the lith. ed. has تنک با. I cannot find the meaning of تنک با, تنک با of course means one foot

of his reign suffer any defeat except this. When he arrived at Mandu and the damages sustained by his army had been repaired ¹ he appointed Sultan Chivath ud din who was his true born son to raid the town of Surat which had been founded on the bank of the Tapti and was one of the famous ports of Gujrat. Sultan Chivath ud din returned after having ravaged a number of places pertaining to Surat. It so happened that (at this time) information of the deceit and treachery and hostilities of Nizam ul mulk the *ra'is* and his sons reached Sultan Mahmud and by his order they were punished.

In the year 857 A H 1453 A D Sultan Mahmud confirmed his determination to conquer the country of Marwar but as he was not assured in his mind from the side of Sultan Qutb ud din he thought it advisable that he should in the first instance conclude a treaty with the latter and after that undertake the conquest of Konbha's dominions. He kept this hidden in his mind and gave orders for the equipment of his army and went from Shadiabad to the town of Dhar. He sent Taj Khan from that place with a well-equipped army to the border of Gujrat so that he might introduce the matter of the treaty. Taj Khan wrote letters to the *ra'is* of Sultan Qutb ud din and sending them by the hands of eloquent emissaries conveyed the message that disputes and hostility between the two sides were a cause of injury to the people and peace and amity the cause of safety and prosperity. After much discussion Sultan Qutb ud din expressed his consent to a treaty of peace and great and pious men from both sides having intervened strengthened the treaty by engagements and oaths. It was settled that the Qutbi army should plunder and ravage such parts of Konbha's dominions as were contiguous to Gujrat and Mahmud Shah should take possession of the country of Mewar and Ajmir and all the neighbouring countries and whenever necessary either of the parties should not refuse to aid and help the other.

¹ Firishlah lith. ed. agrees but Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 18) says that Gheias-ood-deen with the right wing of the army fled to Surat where he plundered the country etc.

² The word حری appears to be required after ب افعل but does not appear either in the MSS. or in the lith. ed. It is in the lith. ed. of Firishlah and I have inserted it in the text.

THE SULTĀNS OF MĀLWA

the year 858 A H , 1454 A D , Sultān Mahmūd advanced to the rebellious Rājput̃s, who had raised the standard of recusancy in the territories of ¹ Hāraut̃ī, and made many Rājput̃s town of ² Mahōlī food for the sword, and having seized their and families sent them to Mandū From that place he ed towards Biyāna, and when he arrived near it, and as Dāūd the governor of Biyāna sent much tribute, and came in the way lty and sincerity, he left the territory in his possession He his excellent exertions, changed a ³ dispute, which had existed a Yūsuf Khān Hindaunī and the governor of Biyāna, into friend- and attachment At the time of his return, he left the nent of the forts of Rantambhōr and Hāraut̃ī in the charge m Khān who had the title of ⁴ Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and spread dow of peace and hope on the residents of Shādīābād

the course of the same year, Sikandar Khān and Jalāl Khān ī, who were among the great *amīns* of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn nī Dakinī, sent petitions and incited Sultān Mahmud to seize t of Māhūr, which was one of the great forts of Berār The advanced towards Māhūr ⁵ by way of Hūshangābād ar Khān came and waited on him in the neighbourhood of

he name is written as هادونی in the MSS and in the lith ed In the of Firsihtah it is written as هارونی Col Briggs (vol IV, p 219) has The Cambridge History of India, page 356, does not give the name ountry, but calls the people the "Hāra Rājputs"

he town is called مهولی and مرهولی in the MS , and مهولي in the lith ishtah lith ed has مهولی Mahōtī Neither Col Briggs nor the lge History of India mentions the name

he word which I have translated as "dispute" is written in the MS , and لقاری In the lith ed it is تقاوی , and in the lith ed of Firsihtah

نقاہ None of these words have any meaning in the dictionary which appropriate I believe "dispute", "railing at", than the "dandying which is the meaning of نقاری as the nearest M Hidayat Hosain ined نقامی in the text edition

both MSS have Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn This is incorrect Sultān ud-dīn was the title of the elder son Qadam Khān's title was -dīn Firsihtah lith ed has فدای حان Fīdāī Khān instead of Qadam and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 219) has Fīdwy Khan

Mahmūdabad When he laid siege to Mahur Sultān Ala ud din came with an army as numerous as the stars and as splendid as the sky to aid the besieged garrison Sultān Mahmud finding that he had not the strength to meet him turned back The pen perfumed with musk has narrated these incidents clearly and in detail in the section about the Bahmanī Sultāns

At the time of his return news came from the ¹ enemies that Mubarak K̲han the ruler of Asir had invaded the country of Baklana which is situated between Gujrat and the Deccan and owed fealty and allegiance to Mahmud Shah The latter considering it incumbent on his spirit to protect and favour the ruler of the country turned the reins of his determination in the direction of Baklana and sent Iqbal K̲han and Yusuf K̲han in advance of himself Mubarak K̲han came with a large army to oppose but fled after a massacre Sultān Mahmud returned to Shadiabad after raiding some villages and towns in the territory of Asir

In the year 858 A H news was brought to Sultān Mahmud that the son of Ray Babu the Raja of Baklana wanted to come to him but Mubarak K̲han the ruler of Asir had invaded his country and was laying it waste and was preventing him from coming Sultān Mahmud sent Sultān Ghīyath ud din on wings of speed to put him (Mubarak K̲han) down When the news reached the latter he turned back and went to his own country A son of Babu came with much tribute and received favours and having obtained permission to return went back proud and happy to his own country and Sultān Ghīyath ud din went towards Rantambhor

About this time the Sultān advanced towards Chitōr Kōnbha met him in the way of affability and gentleness and sent a quantity of ² coined gold and silver as tribute As the coins bore Kōnbha's

¹ The word is مرددس in one MS and in the lith ed and مردن in the other MS The only meaning of مرددس that can at all apply is enemies but even that is not appropriate مردن cannot be found in the dictionary Firnhtah leaves out the words ار مرددس in the corresponding passage and gives the full name of Mubarak K̲han as Miran Mubarak Shah Faruqi

One MS has رو نقره مسکوک The other has رو نقره One MS has مسکوک دس فرسناد both these readings are partly incorrect The reading in the lith ed appears to be correct and I have retained it

stamp, they became the cause of an increase of Mahmūd's wrath, and ¹ he returned them, and his men stretched their hands in the way of plunder and rapine, and did not leave a vestige of cultivation and population. He also appointed Maṣūn-ul-mulk to lay waste the country of Mandisōr. And with the object of leaving *thānadārs* there, he wanted to found a town of the name of Kḥaljpūr in the centre of the country. On hearing this, Kōnbhā came in a state of distress and humility and sent a message to the Sultān, that he was prepared to send any amount of tribute that the latter might demand, and after that would never transgress the path of devotion and loyalty on the condition that the Sultān would abandon the project of building Kḥaljpūr. As the rains were approaching, Sultān Mahmūd took as much tribute as pleased his heart, and turned towards Shādiābād. After remaining there for a time, he again advanced in the year 859 A H., 1454 A D., with the object of conquering the country of Mandisōr. On arriving in that neighbourhood, he sent detachments in different directions, and himself took up a position in the centre of the country. Every day news of a fresh victory came to him, and he performed the rites of offering thanks to God.

✓ It so happened that one day a petition came from a detachment, which had been sent in the direction of Hāiautī, to the purport that, the beginning of the rising of the sun of Islām in the country of Hindūstān was from the horizon of Ajmīr, and His Holiness the most learned of the sects ² Shaikh Mu'in-ud-dīn Hasan Sanjarī was at rest in that place, and now as it had come into the possession of the *Kāfir*s, there was no vestige left there of Islām or Musalmāns. As the purport of this petition was received, Sultān Mahmūd turned in the direction of Ajmīr that very day, and after successive marches,

¹ Col Briggs (vol IV, p 221) says in a note that Chittoor was never subjugated by the kings of either Guzerat or Malwa, and therefore Sooltan Mahmood did not return the tribute, because the coins bore Koombho's stamp, but because he did not consider it to be large enough. It appears to me that Sultān Mahmūd did not admit the independence of Rānā Kōnbhā, who was paying tribute off and on, and, therefore, resented the fact that the tribute sent contained coins which bore the Rānā's stamp, and he was probably also dissatisfied with the amount of the tribute.

² The Cambridge History of India, page 357, calls him Shaikh Mu'in-ud-dīn Chishtī.

encamped opposite the tomb which was the receptacle of light and asked for help from the spirit of the *Khwajah* may his tomb be sanctified! (He then) ordered the *balhshu* (pry master) of the army that he should in concert with the *amirs* reconnoitre round the fort and distribute the batteries. At this time ¹Gajadhar who was the commander of the garrison sallied out with a body of renowned Rajputs to give battle. He was however unable to withstand the assaults of Mahmud's troops and retired again into the fort. After that bloody skirmishes were carried on for four days. On the 5th day Gajadhar again came out with all his troops and was slain in the full swing of the fight. A body of Mahmud Shah's soldiers being mixed with those who were fleeing got inside the gates and the conquest of the fort fell to the lot of the Muslims. In every lane there lay heaps of Rajputs that had been slain. Sultan Mahmūd having carried out the rites of offering his thanks to God attained to the honour of circumambulating the grave of the great saint and made plans for the erection of a grand mosque. He conferred the title of *Suf Khan* on *Khwajah Na mat ul lah* and entrusted the rule of the fort to his charge. He made the attendants of that holy place happy by bestowing rewards and stipends on them and then returning towards the fort of Mandalgarh encamped after successive marches on the bank of the river Banas. He nominated *amirs* to different points round the fort. *Kōnbhu* also sent out his army from the fort dividing it into three detachments. The division which confronted *Taj Khan* and that which was opposed to *Ali Khan* fought with arrows and lances and there was "a great battle and a large number of Mahmud

¹ The name is written as *كجادر* *Kajadhar* in the MSS as well as in the lith ed and as *Gajadhar* in the lith ed of *Firishtah*. This latter is of course correct. *Gajadhar* is a corruption of Sanskrit *Gadadhara* i.e. one who bears the name. Col Briggs has got *Gungadhur Ray* which may be derived from *Gangadhara*—a name of *Siva*—meaning one who carries the goddess or river *Ganga*. The *Cambridge History of India* page 307 has *Gajanhar* which has no meaning at all. M. Hidayat Hosain has retained *كجادر* in the text edition.

² Col Briggs (vol IV page 3 footnote) suggests that this was the battle which was commemorated as a great victory obtained by Rana *Koombho* over Sultan Mahmūd on the superb column which the former erected but there is very little similarity between this battle and the victory claimed

Shāh's troops were slain, while an innumerable host of Rājput̃s became food for the sword. When the sovereign of the stars turned his face from the arch of ¹ the fourth heaven towards his private chamber (i.e., the sunset), the two parties took up their quarters in their respective stations. In the morning, the *amīns* and *vazīns* collected in the royal pavilion, and submitted that as during that year the troops had been fighting repeated campaigns and the rainy season was near, it would be fitting and proper, if he would rest and repose for a few days in the capital city of Shādiābād, in order to repair the damage and injury to the army, and make after the rains, with a fully equipped army, a king-like attempt to capture the fort. Sultān Mahmūd returned and rested for some days.

On the 26th Muharram 861 A H, 23rd December, 1456, the Sultān marched with a great army to capture the fort of Mandalgari. In the neighbourhood of Mēwāi, the armies of Nāgōr and Ajmīr and Hārautī came and joined him. From that place they marched together to besiege Mandalgari. On the way, wherever they saw a

by the Rājput̃s. According to the Rājput̃ Annals, the victory took place in 1440 A D, while the date of this battle was 1455 or 1456, 15 or 16 years later, while to take one of the incidents, Sultān Mahmūd was said to have been taken prisoner, and kept in confinement for six months, and then released, see note 6, pages 512, 513. There is no mention of this in the Musalmān histories, and it is scarcely possible that such a thing should have occurred without being noted.

The Cambridge History of India, page 357, does not mention this battle at all, and the account given by it is entirely different. According to it, "the siege was opened and the approaches carried up to the walls. On October 19th, 1457, the place was carried by assault, with great slaughter, etc, etc." There is no mention of Rānā Kōnbhā and of his army, and instead of the retreat mentioned by Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah, we have Sultān Mahmūd advancing towards Chitor, and sending columns in different directions to harass the Rājput̃s and to reduce them to subjection. Later on, however, on page 361, when giving a summary of the qualities and achievements of Sultān Mahmūd it says "The more famous column of victory at Chitor is said to commemorate victories over Mahmūd of Gujarāt and Mahmūd of Mālwa. If this is so it, 'like some tall bully lifts its head and lies'."

¹ The MSS and the lith ed of Firishtah have طاق ملک چهارم the arch of the fourth heaven or sky, and I have accordingly adopted it, but the reading in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt طارم چهارم, which has the same meaning, sounds very well, and I had a mind to retain it.

temple they razed it to the ground. On their arrival at their destination he gave orders to cut down all the trees from the roots and having pulled down all structures left no trace of cultivation or population. Then they commenced the siege and carrying the batteries beyond the ditches took them close to the wall of the fort. In a short time the citadel was captured by the help of Divine Providence. A large number of men were taken prisoners or ¹ were slain. The Rajputs took shelter in a second fort which was situated on the top of a hill and felt proud of its strength and protection. But as the water of the reservoirs above the fort had failed owing to the concussion of the cannon and the water which had been stored in the first fort had fallen into the hands of Mahmud Shah's troops owing to the want of water cries of weeping and anguish rose from all sides and the garrison crying thirsty thirsty begged for quarter and agreed to pay a sum of ten *lakhs* of *tanikas* as tribute and coming out ² with an assurance of safety surrendered the fort. This great victory appeared on the stage of events on the ³ 1st *Dhī hijjah* in the year 871 A H. Sultan Mahmūd performed the rites of offering praise and thanks to God in a spirit of great humility and submission and entering the fort on the following day demolished the idol temple and used the materials for the construction of a *Jama Mosque*. He appointed a *Qadī* (judge) a *Muftī* (judge or one who issues *fatwas* or decisions) a *Mukhtasib* or censor of public morals a *Khatīb* or a reader of prayers and a *Muadhdhan* or one who calls worshippers to perform the *Namaṣ* at fixed hours and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood in the best way advanced on the ⁴ 15th Muharram in the year 862 A H. in the direction of Chitōr.

¹ One MS and the lith ed have *فصل* while the other MS has *صل*

One MS and the lith ed have *سامان* while the other MS has *سالى* below

³ Firishtah lith ed has the 20th *Dhī hijjah* 86 A H. as the date of the victory and Col Briggs (vol IV p 224) has Zeehuj 20 861 A H. 8th November 1457

⁴ Both MSS have 15th Muharram 86 A H. while the lith ed has 15th Muharram ul haram in the year 89_ which is manifestly incorrect as to the year. Firishtah lith ed has 15th Muharram 863 A H. and Col Briggs (vol IV p 224) has 16th Mohurram A H. 86^o December 4th 1457

When he arrived in that neighbourhood, he sent Shāhzāda Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn to raid and ravage the countries of Kilwārah¹ and Dilwārah. The Shāhzāda laid the country waste, captured many prisoners, and returned under the wings of help and safety. After some days Shāhzāda² Qadam Khān and Tāj Khān were nominated to attempt the capture of the fort of Būndī. When the Shāhzāda arrived in the vicinity of the fort, the Rājput̃s came out of it and commenced a fight. They exerted themselves to the best of their ability, but being in the end routed, became food for the sword, and a number of them having thrown themselves into the ditch were taken prisoners. On the first day of the attack they captured the fort by the strength of their arms, and their bravery and courage. The Shāhzāda having offered thanks for this great gift in the best way, left one of his trusted chiefs in that place, and with victory and triumph, returned to the capital city of Shādiābād in the foot steps of his father and patron.

In the year 863 A H, 1458 A D, (the Sultān)³ again mounted to punish and chastise the Rājput̃s. When he encamped in the village of⁴ Ahār, he appointed Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn and⁵ Qadam Khān to raid the countries of Kilwārah and Dilwārah. They ravaged that country, and also raided the country round Kōnbhalmīr. When they waited on their father, and Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn dilated on the praise of that fort, Sultān Mahmūd advanced the next day towards it. On the way he demolished temples and traversed the different stages. When he encamped in the vicinity of Kōnbhalmīr, he mounted his horse one day, and went to the top of a hill which was situated on its eastern side, and reconnoitred the city. He then declared that the

¹ One MS and the lith ed have Kilwārah and Dilwārah, while the other MS has Kilwārah and Malwārah.

² The text edition has قدن خان.

³ One MS omits the words گونشمال راجپوتان سواری نمود - و چون. and has instead نامرد فرمود بموضع اهار فرود آمد and then as in the other MS and in the lith ed and in the lith ed of Firishtah.

⁴ One MS and the lith ed and the lith ed of Firishtah have بموضع اهار, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 225) has the town of D'har.

⁵ The name is variously written as Qadam Khān, Fidāi Khān, and Fidwī Khān.

capture of the fort would not be possible without a siege lasting some years. The next day he started from that place and advanced towards Dungarpur. When he encamped on the bank of the Dūngarpur reservoir ¹ Rāy Syam Dās the Rājā of the place fled and took shelter in the foot hills and coming out again from that place in great humility and distress gave a tribute of two *lahs* of *tanlas* and twenty one horses. The Sultān then returned to his capital of Shadiabad.

In Muharram 866 A H September 1461 A D he advanced by rapid stages to conquer the country of the Deccan at the instigation of Malik Nizam ul mulk Ghurī. ² When he crossed the river Nerbada the scouts brought the news that Mubārak Khan the ruler of Asir had surrendered the deposit of his life. And Ghīzī Khan his son who bore the title of Ādil Khan had taken his place. In the beginning of his rule he had stretched out his hands of ³ tyranny from the sleeve of oppression had unjustly ordered ⁴ Saiyid Kamal ud din and Saiyid Sultān to be slain and had laid waste the houses of the victims. After some days their brother named Saiyid Jalal ud din came to Sultān Mahmud praying for justice. The latter in order to help him determined to chastise Ādil Khan and with this intention marched towards Asir. Ādil Khan in his helplessness and humility sent one of the grandsons (descendants) of Qutb Ālam

¹ He is called Ray Syam Das in one MS and Ray Sam Das in the other and Sam Das in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has Ray Sam Dās and Col Briggs (vol IV page 25) has Sham Das. I have adopted Syam Das as it is nearest to the Sanskrit name.

² Firishtah and Col Briggs agree see also page 87 in the account of Nizam Shah Bahmani from which it would appear that the invasion was at the instigation of Malik Nizam ul mulk Ghurī but the Cambridge History of India page 307 says that Humayun Shah caused Malik Nizam ul mulk Ghurī to be assassinated and it was at the instance of his family who escaped to Mandu that Sultan Mahmud Khalji invaded the Deccan.

³ The Cambridge History of India page 358 dismisses the matter of the advance on Asir with the rather inadequate and misleading statement composed a recent quarrel with Ādil Khan II of Khandesh.

⁴ Both MSS have ظلم but the lith ed and the lith ed of Firishtah have نظم

⁵ Col Briggs (vol IV pp 25-6) has Syud Kamal and Syud Sooltan two of the most respectable and holy persons of the age but I cannot find his authority for doing so.

Shaikh Faṛīd-ud-dīn Mas'ūd Shakaiganj to wait on him, and sending some tribute, prayed for the pardon of his offences. As Sultān Mahmūd knew that the arrow of the plan of no conqueror of forts had ever reached the battlements of the strong bastions of Asir, and besides the real object of this expedition was the conquest of the Deccan, he drew the pen of forgiveness over the volume of 'Ādil Khān's offences, and having given him some advice, turned towards the country of Berār and Elchpūr.

On his arrival in the town of Bālāpūr, his scouts brought the news that the *vazīrs* of ¹ Nizām Shāh had summoned and collected the troops from the different frontiers and having drawn two *crores* of *tankas* from the treasury, had disbursed it, in the way of help to their expenses, to the *amīns* and the commanders, and they had come out of the city of Bidar with a large army and one hundred and fifty elephants of mountain-like size, and were waiting for the appearance of secret hidden in the providence of God, may His greatness be glorified! Sultān Mahmūd, on hearing this news, put his troops in order, and by repeated marches arrived within three *farsangs* of Nizām Shāh. ² The *vazīrs* placed the eight year old Nizām Shāh

¹ The eight years old son of the tyrant Humāyūn Shāh, who had in the meantime succeeded him.

² There are some differences in the readings. One MS has وزراء نظام شاه, while the other has وراى نظام شاه را سوار كردند, and the lith. ed. has the same reading as the first MS, with the difference that it has وراى instead of وزراء. I have adopted the reading of the first MS. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 226) says that the young king was placed on an elephant, but the use of the word عنان bridle, shows that this is not correct. The account of the battle as given in the Cambridge History of India, page 358, is somewhat misleading. It is said there that, "when the two armies met, that of the Deccan got some slight advantage, but the precipitate action of a slave named Sikandar Khān, who had charge of the person of the child king, decided the fate of the day." As a matter of fact the Deccan army gained a decisive victory and the Mālwa army fled and was pursued for two *karōhs*, and Sultān Mahmūd's camp was plundered, and the fate of the day was not decided by the precipitate action of the person in charge of the child king, but as so often happened in other battles, was due to the victorious troops having dispersed in search of plunder, and Sultān Mahmūd coming out of ambush with a body of fresh troops at the psychological moment. The person who took away the young king towards Bidar was not, according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah, Sikandar

on a horse and raising the royal umbrella over his head placed the bridle of the horse in the hand of Khwajāh Jahān Malik Shah Turk. The command of the left wing was entrusted to Malik Nizam ul mulk Turk and of the right wing to Khwajāh Mahmud Gilani who had the title of Malik ut tujjar. When the two *Badshahs* arrived in front of each other Malik ut tujjar acting with great quickness fell on the left wing of Sultan Mahmud's army and both Mahabat Khan the governor of Chanderi and Zahir ul mulk the *ra'is* who were the commanders of it were slain and a great defeat fell on the Mandu army so that it was pursued to a distance of two *karohs* and Sultan Mahmud's camp was plundered.

At this time Sultan Mahmud who had betaken himself to a corner and was waiting for an opportunity (saw that) most of the *Dakins* were engaged in plundering and Nizam ul mulk was striding with only a few men round him appeared with twelve thousand horsemen from behind Nizam Shah's army. Khwajāh Jahan Turk who was the leader of the centre of the army turned round and seizing the bridle of Nizam Shah's horse turned towards the city of Bidar. The tables were now turned and the men who had gone away in search of plunder were deprived of the beautiful capital of their lives.

Malka-i-Jahan the mother of Nizam Shah having suspicion of deceit and treachery left Mallu Khan to guard the city of Bidar and went away herself to Firuzabad taking her son with her. From that place she sent a letter to Sultan Mahmud Gujrati and asked for his help and reinforcements. And Sultan Mahmud followed on and besieged Bidar. When the people having run away gathered round Nizam Shah at Firuzabad and the news was received that Sultan Mahmud Gujrati who had determined to help Nizam Shah with a huge army would be soon arriving Sultan Mahmud having held a consultation decided in the end that as the air had become hot and the month of Ramadan had drawn near it would be best and

Khan but Khwajāh Jahan Turk. It is true that in the letter which Nizam Shah or his mother or his ministers wrote to Sultan Mahmud Gujrati they said that Sikandar Khan and Khwajāh Jahan carried him off to Bidar but not till an arrow from Sultan Mahmud's army hit the elephant on which Sikandar Khan was riding and the animal became unruly so that Sikandar Khan's action can scarcely be described as precipitate (see note 1 pp. 87-89)

most proper, that he should defer the conquest of the country till the next year, and should then return, and with this pretext, he started on the following day for his own territory.

Again in the year 867 A.H., 1462 A.D., as he had the conquest of the Deccan in his mind, he again equipped his army, and encamped at ¹ Nasratābād Na'icha, and he was still there, when a petition of Shihāz-ul-mulk the *thāmadār* of the fort of Kehrla arrived with the information, that Nizām Shāh Dakinī had sent Nizām ul-mulk with a large army to attack the *thāma* of Kehrla, and on the way news came that Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, having arrived, had attacked the fort of Kehrla, and also that when Nizām-ul-mulk had arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort, Suāy-ul-mulk was intoxicated, and had no notice of what was happening, but his son came out of the fort, and after putting up some fight fled. ² Nizām-ul-mulk, owing to his great pride and haughtiness, did not occupy himself in arranging the affairs of the place. Sultān Mahmūd, on receiving this news, sent Maqbūl Khān with four thousand horsemen in the direction of the fort, and himself advanced towards Daulatābād to have his revenge. On the way, the adherents of the Rāy ³ Sukaja and the *zakils* (representatives) of the Rāy of Jājnagar brought five hundred and thirty elephants as tribute. Sultān Mahmūd bestowed robes of honour and rewards on them, and gave them permission to return. When he encamped in the village of Khalifa-ābād, one of the servants

¹ Both the MSS have *نصرت آباد نعلچہ* but the lith. ed. has only *نعلچہ*, while Firishtah lith. ed. has *ظفر آباد نعلچہ*. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Nalcha. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the incidents connected with Kehrla.

² This is the version of Nizām ul mulk's proceedings in the *Tabaqāt*, both in the MSS and in the lith. ed., but Firishtah has a different account. According to him, Nizām ul mulk entered the fort with the troops which were fleeing, and took possession of it, but was murdered the same day by some Rājput foot soldiers. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) makes the matter clearer, by saying that "the place had fallen into the hands of Nizām ul Moolk, but that he, having exercised excessive tyranny towards the inhabitants had been put to death by a party of Rajpoot infantry." The Cambridge History of India, page 359, mentions the fact of Nizām ul mulk's occupation of Kehrla but does not mention his death.

³ The word is written *سرکجه* in the MSS and in the lith. ed., and also in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, but Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 228) has Surgooja.

of the *Amir ul mu'minin* (the *amir* of the Muslims) *Mustanjad Billah Yusuf bin Abbas* brought for him a mandate conferring imperial rule under a robe of chieftainship from Egypt. In his great joy and delight he carried out the rites of welcoming the servants of the *Khalifa* treated them with great honour and bestowed on them horses with jewelled saddles and bridles and embroidered robes of honour.

When he arrived on the frontier of Daulatabad (they) informed him that Sultān Mahmud Gujrati had come out of his capital and was advancing towards the place. Sultān-Mahmūd advanced towards the fort of ¹ Malkonda and having raided and ravaged some villages and hamlets returned to his capital of Shadiabad by way of Gōndwara. He rested there for some days and sent some troops under the command of Maqbūl *Khan* in Rabi' ul awwal in the year 871 A.H. to plunder and ravage the town of Elichpur. When they plundered the city after occupying the surrounding country the governor of the place after a part of the night had passed collected his neighbours such as Qadī *Khan* and Pīr *Khan* and with fifteen hundred horsemen and innumerable foot soldiers came out to fight. When Maqbūl *Khan* got this news he despatched the booty and other goods and his equipments with one body of troops and he selected and kept the most useful men with him and appointed ³ some detachments

¹ Col Briggs says in a note in vol. IV page 29 of his History. I am not aware of any town in Berar bearing this name and the Telugoo termination *ronda* renders it likely to be an error of transcribers. It may be in Nulka-poor which lies in the direct route of the King's retreat.

² One MS substitutes *ساحه* for *ساح*.

³ The reading in the MSS and in the lith. ed. appear to be incorrect. The MSS have *برای حدادول* and *برای حدوالی* while the lith. ed. has *برای حدولی*. The reading in *Firishtah* is *جمعی حد برای جنگ*. This appears to be the correct reading and I have adopted it. As to the incidents connected with Elichpur *Firishtah* agrees generally with the exception pointed out in the preceding note. Col Briggs (vol. IV page 29) quotes an account of the incidents from what he calls the best authenticated history I have seen without however giving its name. It agrees generally with the *Tabaqat* and *Firishtah*. In this account however it is stated distinctly what is perhaps implied in the other accounts viz. The enemy as he anticipated attacked the army for the sake of plundering the camp equipage etc. and at the very

for engaging in a battle, and himself remained in ambush. When the two parties engaged each other Maqbūl Khān came out of ambush, and Ghāzī Khān fled towards Elichpūr. Maqbūl Khān pursued him to the gate of the city. On the way twenty of the notable leaders were slain and thirty were taken prisoners. Maqbūl Khān returned from that place victorious and triumphant to Mahmūdābād (i.e., Kehrāla).

In Jamādī-ul-āwwal 871 A.H., January 1467 A.D., the ruler of the Deccan sent a man of the name of ¹ Qādī Shaikhān to the capital city of Shādīābād for effecting a treaty of peace, and after much interchange of views peace was concluded on these ² terms that the ruler of the Deccan should leave the country of Berār as far as Elichpūr in the possession of Sultān Mahmūd, and the latter should not henceforward cause any damage to the country of the Deccan. A treaty of peace was written containing these terms and received the agreement of the *amīns* and great men and divines of the kingdom. In the month of Jamādī-ul-ākhir in the aforementioned year, a robe of honour and the usual remuneration was bestowed on the ambassador Shaikhān, and ³ Mashīr-ul-mulk was sent with him so that the treaty and the agreement might be confirmed in the presence of each other.

moment they expected to be crowned with victory, Mukbool Khan charging with his cavalry on the rear of the assailants gave them a total defeat."

¹ The name is *فامی شیخ* in one MS and in the lith. ed., and *فامی سیخ* in the other MS. It is not mentioned by Firishtah, who says the rulers of the Deccan and Mālwa sent their emissaries to meet together and does not mention the names of those emissaries.

² The terms are slightly different according to Firishtah lith. ed., which says that the ruler of the Deccan should leave Sultān Mahmūd in possession as far as Elichpūr and of the country of Gōndwāra and Baqālī, as far as Kehrāla, and Sultān Mahmūd should cause no injury to the country of the Deccan. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, page 230) says that "it was agreed, according to some historians, that Kehrāla should be retained by Malwa, and that it should be considered as the southern limit of the kingdom, while others have asserted, that Elichpūr was ceded to Malwa on condition of the King refraining from invading the Deccan in future." The Cambridge History of India, page 359, says that Mahmūd's possession of Kehrāla was confirmed, but the integrity of Berār, with that exception, was maintained.

³ The name is Mashīr-ul-mulk and Shēr-ul-mulk in the MSS and Sharf-ul-mulk in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned anywhere else. M. Hidayat Hosain has *سیر الملک* in the text edition.

After some days Sultān Mahmud ordered that the accounts of the offices should be kept according to lunar dates and these dates should be written instead of the solar dates and from the year 871 A H the lunar dates were entered in the accounts of all offices

In the month of Rabi ul awwal of the aforementioned year ¹ Shaikh Nur ud din who was one of the most learned men of the age arrived in the neighbourhood of Mandu Sultān Mahmud went as far as the *Haud i rāni* the ram's tank or reservoir to meet him and they embraced each other at the heads of their horses and the Sultan showed him great honour and respect

In Dhi hijjah of the aforesaid year Maulana Imad an emissary of Saiyid Muhammad Nur Bakhsh came and waited on Sultān Mahmud He brought the pitched garb of the Shaikh as a gift of good omen The Sultan considered the arrival of the garb a sign of good fortune and welcomed the arrival of Maulana Imad ud din with gratitude and owing to his great pleasure and happiness kissed the garb and opening his hand of liberality and lavishness made all the learned men and Shaikhs and honoured men of the country who were present in the assembly delighted and fortunate

In the month of Muharram 872 A H August 1467 ³ swift messengers who could race with the wind brought to the notice of

¹ The name is Shaikh Nur ud din in the MSS and also in the lith ed and the place of his arrival is مندو Mandu in one MS and مندور in the other while it is مندسور Mandisor in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed calls the man Shaikh Ala ud din and the place of his arrival the neighbourhood of Shadiabad Mandu

² One MS has ح instead of طلى and حرفه را بوسده instead of حرفه را بوسده by mistake M Hidayat Hosain has however retained حرفه را بوسده in the text edition

³ Firishtah and Col Briggs agree generally but the Cambridge History of India page 359 says that Muhammad III of the Deccan tampered with the loyalty of Maqbul Khan and the latter surrendered the fortress to the son of the Raja when Mahmud had imprisoned and it also calls Taj Khan and Ahmad Khan Mahmud's sons I cannot find any authority for these statements In the genealogy of the kings of Malwa on page 713 of the History Ghiyas ud din is shown as the only son of Sultan Mahmud I though we know that there was at least one other son Qadam Khan or Fidayi Khan also known as Sultan Ala ud din It may be that the name of the only son of Sultan Mahmud

the Sultān, that Maqbūl Khān, of perverted destiny, had ravaged the town of Mahmūdābād, which is now celebrated as Kehīla, and had applied to the ruler of the Deccan for protection, and had also made over some elephants, which had for administrative purposes been kept with him to the Rāyzāda of Kehīla, and the latter had taken possession of the town, and had put all Musalmāns, who had been residing in the fort, to death. He had also made a tribe of Gōnds join him, and had by their help closed up all roads. Immediately on hearing this news, Sultān sent Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān to put down this rebellion, and he himself also encamped at N'alcha on the 20th Rabi'-ul-ākhīr of the aforementioned year, and after a few days he started towards Mahmūdābād. News reached him on the way that Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān had reached that place on the ¹ *Dussehra* day, which is a great day of the Brahmans, after making a forced march of seventy *larōhs*. When they were informed that the Rāyzāda was at his meal, Tāj Khān said, "It is not the act of a brave man to attack an enemy, when he is unaware of his danger." He therefore stopped his horse there, and sent a man to the Rāyzāda and gave him notice. The latter withdrew his hand from his food, and took up his arms and with his men came out to give battle. Such great exertions were made by the two parties, that nothing greater can be imagined. In the end most of the Rāyzāda's men became food for the sword, and he himself fled with head and feet bare, and sought the protection of the Gōnds. The elephants which had been with Maqbūl Khān and other booty and the town of Mahmūdābād again came into Sultān Mahmūd's possession. When the report of Tāj Khān reached Sultān Mahmūd he was extremely delighted. He appointed Malik-ul-umarā Malik Dāūd to chastise the tribe who had given shelter to the Rāyzāda. When this news reached them, they sent the Rāyzāda under confinement to Tāj Khān.

After the victory Sultān Mahmūd marched towards Mahmūdābād, and encamped on the 6th of Rajab-ul-murajjab, in the town of Sārangpūr. At that place, after a few days Khwājah Jamāl-ud-dīn

who became a ruler of Mālwa is given in the genealogy, but the names of five sons of Hūshang Shāh, none of whom ascended the throne, are given

¹ One MS has, by mistake, دور سهره

Astrabadī came as an ambassador from the honoured ¹ Mirza Abu Sa'id with fine presents and gifts. Sultan Mahmūd was very pleased and delighted on his arrival and made him happy with royal favours and gave him permission to return. He also sent various presents of the articles of Hindūstan such as different kinds of silk and linen fabrics and some ² slave girls skilled in dancing and singing and some elephants and some eunuchs and a few *Sharihs* and talking *Tutis* (parrots) and some Arab horses in charge of Shaikhzādā Ala'ud-dīn in company with Khwajah Jamal'ud-dīn. The Sultan then remained (for some time) in Shādīabad.

In the year 873 A.H. 1468 A.D. a petition came from Ghazi Khān to the effect that the *zamīndars* of Kachwarah had placed their feet outside the high road of allegiance. Immediately on its arrival Sultan Mahmud taking the difficulties of the entrances and exits from the country into his consideration planned the erection of a fortress in the centre of the country which was completed in the course of six days. It received the name of Jalalpur and ⁴ Mirza Khān was placed in charge of it.

On the 8th Sha'ban of the aforementioned year ⁵ Shaikh

¹ Ruler of Transoxiana third in descent from Timur and grandfather of Babar

One MS inserts *سوحاب* after *نعمت‌های*

² One MS has *حد کبرکی رفاس و گونده* the other has *حد کبر حاص* and I have adopted it. Col Briggs (vol IV page 232) says that dancing women and singers mounted on elephants superbly caparisoned together with a number of Indian and Abyssinian slaves for the seraglio. He calls the *sharihs meenas* but this is not correct. The dictionary describes *sharihs* as a species of talking bird a grackle a nightingale. In Bengali *suls* and *saris* are said to be two kinds of talking birds, the former being supposed to be the male and the latter the female and as far as I know the *sharik* is a variant of *sari* the *tuti* being the *sul* or parrot. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the presents but otherwise generally agrees with the text.

⁴ The name is *منبر حان* in one MS and in the lith ed. It is *میرا حان* in the other MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah and Meer Khan in Col Briggs (vol IV p 233). The name is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India. M. Hidayat Hosain has *منبر حان* in the text edition.

⁵ The name is Shaikh Muhammad Farnali in the MSS and in the lith ed of Firishtah but the lith ed of the Tabaqat and the Cambridge History of India have Shaikhzada Muhammad Qarnali (p 360).

Muhammad Farmalī and Kapūr Chand, son of the Rāja of Gwāliar came as ambassadors of Sultān Bahlūl Lūdi, the *Bādshāh* of Dehlī, and waited upon the Sultān Mahmūd, in the neighbourhood of Fathābād, and offered the presents which they had brought. They also submitted the following by word of mouth, "Sultān Husam Sharqī does not keep his hand from me. If his Majesty the Sultān comes to the neighbourhood of Dehlī to help and reinforce me, and removes from me the disturbance created by him, I shall make over the fortress of Biyāna with its dependencies as tribute at the time of his return, and whenever the Sultān would advance in this direction I shall send six thousand horsemen, with necessary equipments, to wait on, and accompany him." Sultān Mahmūd said, "Whenever Sultān Husam should advance towards Dehlī, I shall with great rapidity betake myself to you and support you." Upon this agreement he conferred great favours on the ambassadors, and bestowed on them valuable robes of honour, and bade them farewell.

On the following day he started from that place, and advanced towards his capital of Shādiābād. As the air was extremely hot on the road, his health fell out of ¹equability and his illness became greater day by day, till on the 19th *Dhī-q'adah* in the year 873 A H, ² May 26th 1569, he passed away in the country of Kachwārah from the waste country of the world to the happy land of the after life. The period of his reign was thirty-four years.

Couplet

Although with grandeur to the sky he lifts the throne,
To the ³ grandeur of the burial, at last, he carries his all

¹ The readings in the MSS are *ار اعتدال* and *ار حد اعتدال* and in the lith ed *با اعتدال*. I have adopted the first reading, while in the text-edition it is *ار حد اعتدال*.

² The Cambridge History of India (p. 360) gives June 1st 1469 as the date of the death. Firishtah agrees with the *Tabaqāt* in saying that the Sultān died in the country of Kachwārah, but the Cambridge History of India, page 360, says he expired shortly after his arrival at Mandū, or as it always wrongly calls it Māndū.

³ The MSS and the lith ed of Firishtah have *بحاله لحد*, but the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* has *بحاله لحد*, which would of course mean to the well or pit of the burial, this last has been adopted in the text edition.

The similarity between the age of Sultan Mahmud at the time of his accession with the period of his reign is not without a certain singularity and curiosity. His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunction Amir Timur Gurgan also ascended the throne of the empire as a matter of permanence in his 36th year and the period of his reign was also 36 years and after his death 36 of his sons and grandsons were ¹ living and in their places.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN GHIYATH UD DIN SON OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD KHALJĪ

When Sultan Mahmud Khaljī passed away his eldest son Sultan Ghiyath ud din sat on the throne of the empire and putting out the hand of liberality and lavishness from the sleeve of generosity and beneficence made all the sections of the people satisfied and grateful. He distributed the gold which had been scattered over his umbrella among men of culture and other deserving people. ³ He confirmed the territory of Ranthambhor which have been already allotted to him to his younger brother who bore the title of Sultān Ala ud din and was known as Qadam Khan. He in order to please him also bestowed on him certain other *parganas* which had been in his

¹ There are slight differences in the readings. One MS has حی فام و دند another has و فام مدام و دند اند while the lith ed has و فام بود اند. Firishtah lith ed has no corresponding passage. The second reading has been adopted in the text edition.

There are differences in the heading also. One MS has what I have got in the text the other has دکر سلطان عاب الدی حاجی while the lith ed has only دکر سلطان عاب الدی.

³ Firishtah has he made فیدل خان Fīdī Khan his brother happy by conferring on him شهر نو *Shahr-i Nau* and certain other *parganas* which he had in his possession in the time of Sultan Mahmud Khaljī. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 36) calls the brother Fīdwy Khan but agrees with the Tabaqat in saying that Ranthunbhor was conferred on him to be held in perpetuity. The Cambridge History of India page 361 says that his next brother Taj Khan was confirmed in his fiefs and received the title of Ala ud din and his younger brother Fīdai Khan was permitted to retain Ranthambhor and other district. Neither the Tabaqat nor Firishtah mention Taj Khan as a son of Sultan Mahmud Khaljī and they say that Qadam Khan or Fīdī Khan had the title of Sultan Ala ud din فدس حل in the text edition.

possession in the time of Sultān Mahmūd He made Shāhzāda 'Abd-ul-qādu his heir, after conferring on him the title of ¹ Nāsir Shāh, and entrusted the duties of the *vazārat* to him He conferred on him the umbrella and palanquin and polished still-ball as ensigns of royalty, and a *jāgīr* of twelve thousand horsemen He also gave orders to the *Khāns* and *amīns*, that they should go every morning to salute him, and come to the palace in attendance at his stirups When he had finished the festivities and rites of the accession, he sent for the *amīrs* one day, and said, "As I have spent 34 years at the stirups of my father in labours and expedition, it now comes to my mind, that I should endeavour to guard what has come to me from my father, and should not give myself the trouble to acquire more, and should open the ² door of peace and rest, and pleasure and enjoyment on me, and those depending on me It is better to keep the territories in ³ peace and quiet, than to strike one's hand on those of others " He commenced to endeavour to collect musicians, and they came to his threshold from all directions He filled his seraglio with ⁴ beautiful slave girls and daughters of Rājas and *zamīndārs*, and in this matter made very great exertions He taught an art and a profession to each of the beautiful girls, and taking their fitness into consideration, taught some the arts of dancing and singing, and others those of reading and recitation and playing on the flute, and a small number the art of wrestling He had five hundred Abyssinian slave

¹ Firishtah and Col Briggs say that the title of Sooltan Nasir-ood-Deen was conferred by Gheias ood-deen on his eldest son, and he was made heir-apparent and *vazīr* The Cambridge History of India, page 362, says that Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn "associated him with himself in the business of government " It appears, however, more correct to say that the Sultān left the government entirely in his hands

² One MS has *در امن و آسایس و عشرت* The other has *امانیش*, incorrectly, for *اسابیس* The lith ed has *عیش و عشرت* before *عیش و* This appears to me to be better than either of the two other readings, and has been adopted as correct

³ One MS has *در دامن و امان داشن* and both MSS have *نه* instead of *بهتر* and *دست رند* instead of *دست رند*, in the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has adopted the first reading

⁴ One MS and the lith ed have *کنران صاحب*, while the other MS has *کدر فا صاحب*

girls dressed in male attire and arming them with swords and shields gave them the name of the *Habinash* band. He also called five hundred Turkī slave girls in the Turkī dress as the Mughul band. He also trained five hundred slave girls who were distinguished for the strength of their genius and the keenness of their intelligence in various kinds of learning and he had one of them join him every day at his meals. He selected a number of them and entrusted various affairs of state such as the office of demands and the watching of receipts and expenditure of the country and the supervision of various factories to them.

¹ He also established a market in his harem so that whatever went to the market of the city for sale was also sold there. Altogether sixteen thousand slave girls were collected in his harem and each one of them had every day two silver *tankas* and two *mans* of grain and in equalising this allowance he acted with the greatest meticulousness so that Rām Kṛṣṇa who was the highest of the members of the seraglio and had great love for him and great authority in all affairs also had two *mans* of grain by lawful weight and two *tankas*. He had also ordered a servant that he should place every day cooked food at the mouths of the holes of mice and rats. He had also ordered his officers that when he offered thanks for the gifts of the great and holy God and when the benefits which the great God had showered on him came before eyes they should give fifty *tankas* by way of thanks offering to deserving men and ² should not suspend it during

¹ The Cambridge History of India page 362 says: A replica in miniature of the great bazar in the city was erected within the precincts of the palace and was filled with the artists, artisans and craftswomen of the harem. This does not convey the meaning of the statement in the text.

² Firishtah agrees but he adds *عبر سرداران و سرداران* i.e. except *sardars* (chiefs) and *mansabdars* but this does not agree with *Ṭabaqat* according to which even Rām Kṛṣṇa had the usual allowance. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 36) gives each of them two seers of grain and two tankas of copper. The Cambridge History of India does not give the exact amount paid to each woman but adds (p. 36) that the king himself regulated with meticulous nicety the pay and allowance of all even to the quantities of grain, fodder and meat allotted to the various animals employed or domesticated in the harem.

³ The reading is doubtful and the meaning is obscure. The readings in MSs are *و بحراب معطل ندارند* and *و بحراب معطل ندارند* which are clearly incorrect.

sleep. ¹ He also ordered that to each person young or old to whom he might speak anything outside, they should give one thousand *tankas* in the shape of a reward. Most of his time was passed in pleasure and enjoyment. After a watch of the night had passed, he girded the belt of service, in the middle of his life, and occupied himself with the ceremonies of worship, and rubbed his forehead in the dust of humility and poverty, and entering by the door of humility begged for the grant of his object and desires from the great and holy God.

He had given an order to one who was near him, that he should bring to his notice at a fitting place, whatever might take place in his kingdom, and any petition that might come from any frontiers (of his kingdom). If in any affair of the country, there was doubt among the *vazīrs* they used to write a statement of the facts and send it to the palace, and he wrote a fitting reply and sent it to them. It is stated that Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī the *Bādshāh* of Dehlī raided the ² town of Alhanpūr, which appertained to the Sultāns of Mālwa, and great injury was done to the residents of the town. No one could place his foot of daing forward and bring this matter to the notice of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn. In the end by the advice and counsel of the *vazīrs*, Hasan took advantage of an opportunity one day, and reported that Sultān Bahlūl used to send every year the whole of the profits, in the form of tribute and *salāmī* (bonus) to the fortunate Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, and it was now being heard that he had committed an act of audacity, and his troops had stretched the arm of plunder and rapine to the town of ³ Alhanpūr. On hearing this news, he immediately sent an order to Shēr Khān, son of Muzaffar Khān,

The lith ed has *و بحواب معطل ندارد*, this seems to be the correct reading, and has been adopted. M Hidayat Hosain, however, has retained the first reading.

¹ The meaning of the payment of this large reward is not clear. It is not clear also what is meant by *در سرون*. Does it mean outside the harem?

² Both MSS have *فصله رسته*, but the lith ed has *فصله رسته*. Firsihtah lith ed has in the corresponding passage *بالدور*. Col Briggs has Runthunbore, and the Cambridge History of India, page 361, has Pālampur near Ranthambhor. The fact that Sultān Ghīyās-ud dīn did not attack Bahlūl Lodī when the latter invaded Mālwa, but ordered Sher Khān to do so is given in the Cambridge History of India, as an illustration of his being averse to war. I think it was due to his laziness and inertia.

³ Here also the MSS have *الهندور*.

the ruler of Chanderi that he should take the armies of Bhilsa and Sanrangpur with him and proceed to chastise Sultān Bahlul. After receiving the order Shēr Khān collected his troops and advanced towards Biyana. As Sultān Bahlul saw that he did not possess the strength to meet Sher Khān he abandoned Biyana and went to Dehli. Sher Khān pursued him and advanced towards Dehli. Sultān Bahlul then by offering terms of peace and making presents turned him back and the latter then rebuilt ¹ Alhanpur and then came back to Chanderi. They narrate that every night he placed some gold *mohurs* under his pillow and every morning he gave them away to deserving people. ² He had ordered seventy slave girls who had memorised the holy *Quran* that at the time when he changed his clothes they would finish the *Quran* and ³ blow their breath on the garment. In ⁴ respect of the beauty of his belief and simplicity they narrate that one day a man brought to him a hoof of an ass and said 'This is a hoof of the ass of Jesus'. He ordered that they should bestow on the man fifty thousand *tanlas* and he bought the hoof. To make the story short three other men who brought three other hoofs also sold each of them for a similar sum. It so happened that another man also brought one in and the Sultān gave orders for giving fifty thousand *tanlas* to him. One of the attendants of His Majesty said

Perhaps the ass of Jesus had five legs so that such a sum is being paid for the fifth hoof. The Sultān said that perhaps this man is telling the truth while one of the others may have brought a wrong

¹ See notes 2 and 3 on page 546. Col Briggs (vol IV p 238) calls the place Lallpur. The year of Bahlul Lodi's invasion is not given in the *Tabaqat Firishtah* says it was in 889 A H while Col Briggs has 887 A H and 1482 A D as the year (vol IV p 237).

This is mentioned by *Firishtah* also but he says that there were one thousand and not seventy slave girls who had memorised the *Quran* and they recited it together when he changed his clothes.

³ This means that each of the slave girls used to blow on the garment after reciting three sevenths of each *parah* of the *Quran* (the *Quran* being divided into thirty *parahs* or parts) in order to render the garments of the king pure blessed or holy.

⁴ This story is mentioned in the *Cambridge History of India* see page 363 but while the Musalman historian mentions it as an illustration of the Sultan's حسن اعتقاد و سادگی لوحی the English historian calls him the crowned fool.

hoof He had also ordered those who were near him, that when he was engaged in pleasure, or was occupied in talking with worldly people, they should bring a piece of cloth before him to which he gave the name of a shroud, and he, taking alarm, would perform his ablutions anew, and having prayed for pardon again occupy himself in worship He had also told the members of his harem with great emphasis, that they should wake him up for the night prayer, and (if necessary) dash water on his face If it so happened that his sleep was heavy, they pulled him out by force and wakened him And if he was engaged in any festive function, and did not rise on receiving one or two intimations, they, according to his orders, caught his hands, and lifted him up People never said a word in his *majlis*, which was contrary to the law of the Prophet or which would cause pain And he never saw (partook of) any intoxicating drinks One ¹ day they had made an electuary for him, and had spent a *lakh* of *tankas* on it He ordered that they should tell him the name of the ingredients, and it then appeared that there were three hundred and odd drugs in one *dīnam* of nutmeg The Sultān said, "This electuary cannot be used by me," and ordered that it should be converted into a morsel of fire Someone said, "Let it be bestowed on someone else " He said, "Alas! that I should prescribe for another, what I do not consider right for myself "

² At one time one of the neighbours of Shaikh Mahmūd Na'mān, who was one of the companions of the Sultān, came to him from Dehli, and said, "I have come remembering the promises and gifts of the Sultān, so that by your intervention, I may get from him the wherewithal for the marriage of my daughter " The Shaikh said, "I am prepared to pay myself the amount you require " He replied "I will not take it from you, I wish that I may partake of the gifts of the Sultān, and my respectability may thereby be increased The

¹ The matter of the electuary is mentioned by Firishtah and his account agrees with that in the text

² This is preceded in the lith ed by the words *حكایت عریب*, a strange story, but these words are not found in either MS The Cambridge History of India, page 363, gives this story also, but omits most of the particulars The man is described as a beggar from Dehli, but the reason of his journey is not mentioned, nor is Shaikh Mahmūd Na'mān, who engineered the fraud

Shaiḫ insisted but the other did not agree At last the Shaiḫ said

I recommend those who come to me on the ground of the greatness of their ancestors or on their own excellences You do not possess either of these qualifications With what qualities shall I praise you?

The man replied I have brought myself to you you act according to your own intelligence and wisdom The Shaiḫ took the man with

him to the audience hall of the Sultān and he told him to take a handful of the wheat which the men were weighing there for the *faqirs*

When the Shaiḫ met the Sultān that man was also behind him

The Sultān said Who is this man? He replied This man has memorised the holy *Quran* He has brought a handful of wheat as a present on each grain of which he has finished the *Quran* The

Sultān said Why did you bring him here? I should have gone to him The Shaiḫ said He does not possess such a position or qualifications that the Sultān should go to him The Sultān said

If he is not fit for it his present is priceless As the Sultān insisted the Shaiḫ settled that the man should bring his presents to the *Jama* Mosque on the following Friday When they had finished their prayers the Sultān ordered that the man should mount the pulpit and throw the grains of wheat in the lap of the Sultān's skirt and the Sultān favoured him with a variety of gifts

¹ They have narrated that one day the Sultān said to his intimates I have collected some thousands of beautiful women in my harem but I have not yet found a person such as my heart desires Of the men who were present one said Perhaps the men who were employed in this service were not perfect in discerning a beautiful person If this slave is employed in this work it is likely that he should find a person that may be agreeable to the Sultān

The Sultān said What do you consider a beautiful person? He

said It is one each part of whose person which comes to the beholder's sight deprives the latter of the desire to see any other part for instance if he sees her figure he becomes so fascinated with her that he has no desire to see her face The Sultān was pleased with

¹ This is also preceded by the word *حکایت* story in the lith ed but the word is omitted in both MSS This story is also narrated by Firḥtāh but it does not appear to be mentioned by Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India

this judgment of his about a woman's beauty The man then took leave of the Sultān and went round the country But although he cast his eyes over all the world, he did not find what he wanted However he arrived at a place, where he saw a young woman, who went walking gracefully Her gait and figure enchanted him When taking great care he cast his eyes on her beautiful face, he found something much better than what he wanted He remained there for some days and, by such trickery as he knew, took her along, and placing her in the service of the Sultān made him happy He told the Sultān that he had bought her for so many thousands *dirams*

After some days, the father and mother of the young woman became acquainted with this matter, and knew that a man, who had stayed in the village for some time, had taken away their daughter Having sought a clue to his name and country, they came to the Sultān praying for justice They happened to meet him at the crossing of two roads and begged for justice The Sultān knew that they were complaining about that particular young lady He did not take a single step from the place where he was, and ordered that men learned in the law should be directed to attend there Then he asked them to pass on him the sentence directed by the law of the Prophet The complainants, on becoming acquainted with the truth of the matter, submitted that their complaint was for this reason that that man had taken away their daughter As she had now become an inmate of the harem of Sultān, it was a matter of honour and happiness to them, more specially as she had become a Musalmān, and had left their faith, and they were now pleased and satisfied

Then the Sultān told the learned men, the woman has now become my lawful wife, but for the time that has passed, you should carry out in respect of me whatever might be the order of the law If I deserve to be put to death, I shall hold you absolved for causing my death The learned men said that whatever is done without knowledge is pardoned in the law, and is absolved by penitence In spite of this decision, the Sultān was repentant about this, and forbade his servants to seek for and produce any women

¹ In the year 887 A H, 1482 A D, there was a conjunction of

¹ These conjunctions are mentioned by Firishtah also He, however, says distinctly that he took the account from the Tabaqāt, and also says that

planets that is Saturn and Jupiter became contiguous and near to each other in degree and minute in the sign of Syrpio and the ¹ five stars were also collected in one sign of the Zodiac The evil caused by these conjunctions appeared in most countries and specially in *Khalji* territories there was much ² disturbance as will clearly be seen from the account of Naṣir Shah

In the year 889 A H 1484 A D an ambassador came from the Ray of Champānūr and submitted a petition to the following effect

When in former times ³ Sultān Mahmud son of Sultān Ahmad besieged Champānūr Sultān Mahmūd Shāh came to help and assist the slaves and ⁴ released us from the siege and now Sultān Mahmud Gujrātī has come and is again besieging Champanūr If your Majesty considering our ancient relations of servitorship to you would advance to release us it would be the cause of an increase of your protection and bravery A sum of one *lakh* of *tanlas* would be remitted to your officers as a contribution towards your expenses When the report reached Sultān he collected his troops and came and took up his residence in the palace of Na Icha The next day he sent for the learned men and the *Qadis* to his *maylis* and asked them for a ruling on this point A Musalman *Badshah* has besieged a hill of a *Kafir* Is it allowed to me according to the law of the Prophet that I should

the coming of Bahlul Ludi and the destruction of Alhanpur or Palanpur was among the effects of these conjunctions They do not appear to be mentioned either by Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India

¹ The five stars are عطارد Mercury زهرة Venus مشتری Jupiter مریخ Mars رجل Saturn

² The MSS have احدثا and the lith ed has احدثا while Firishtah in the corresponding passage has احدثا This last seems to be the most appropriate word and I have adopted it

³ So in both MSS and in the lith ed As a matter of fact the correct name of the son of Sultān Ahmad was Sultan Muhammad Probably Sultān Mahmud who ascended the throne in 862 A H and was contemporaneous with Sultān Mahmud *Khalji* who reigned from 839 A H to 873 A H is meant but he was the son of Sultan Muhammad and grandson of Sultān Ahmad Firishtah lith ed mentions the fact of Sultān Ghiyath ud din's march to Na Icha but he does not mention the particulars of the previous siege Neither Col Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the matter

⁴ One MS has by mistake خلاص بود in tead of خلاص کرده بود

advance to aid the *Kāfis*?" All the learned men said, "It is not allowed" Sultān Gḥḥiyāth-ud-dīn then bade farewell to the ambassador from Chāmpānīr, and went back to his own capital

When old age overtook the Sultān, disputes commenced about the possession of the kingdom between Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn and ¹ Shujā'at Khān, who had the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, and in spite of the fact, that they were twin brothers, things came to such a pass, that they made attempts on the lives of each other Rānī Kḥḥūrshīd, the daughter of the Rāy of Baglāna who was the chief inmate of the harem of Sultān Gḥḥiyāth-ud-dīn, took the side of Shujā'at Khān, and wanted to turn Sultān Gḥḥiyāth-ud-dīn against Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn This matter will be described in the account of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn To be brief, Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn lost the bundle of power and fled from Mandū, and having taken up a position in the centre of the kingdom, brought over the *amīrs* to his side, and coming back besieged the fort of Mandū Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn ² having given encouragement and comfort to a body of five thousand Gujrātīs made vain efforts In the end, the Gḥḥiyāth Shāhī *amīns* opened the gates, and invited Nāsir-ud-dīn into the fort When Shujā'at Khān saw that Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn had entered by the gate, he went and took shelter with

¹ One MS has سماع حال Firishtah's account of the quarrels between two brothers is somewhat more detailed He says they began in 903 A H, 1491 A D, when Sultān Gḥḥiyāth-ud-dīn had become old and decrepit Rānī Kḥḥūrshīd attempted to have Nāsir-ud-dīn seized, whereupon in 905 A H, he fled, and seeing that the Rānī was still bent on his destruction, he took up a position in the centre of the country, and *amīrs* and soldiers came, and joined him, and he assumed the emblems of royalty, and advanced and besieged the fort of Mandū As he had acted as his father's *vazīr* for years, people knew him They opened the gates of the fort and brought him into it without the opposite party knowing anything about it Shujā'at Khān or 'Alā-ud-dīn fled to his father's palace, but he and the Rānī were dragged out, and he and his son were butchered like so many sheep Col Briggs (vol IV, p 239) gives a similar account, but he adds that Nasir-ood-Deen was admitted into the fort by the Tarapoor gate, on the 24th of Rubbee oos-Sany, A H 906, October 22nd, 1500 A D, and also that Alla-ood-Deen and all his children and all his family were put to death The account in the Cambridge History of India, page 363, is somewhat different in some particulars

² One MS has بخود موافق ساتھ between بنکھار گہراہی را and دلاسا کردہ, this is followed in the text edition

his father and after some days when the foundations of the palace of the Naṣir Shahī rule became stronger Shuja ʿt Khan and his sons were summoned to the Sultān's presence and were beheaded. On the 9th of Ramadan in the year 906 A H Sultān Ghīyath ud dīn was attacked by the disease of dysentery and joined the vicinity of God.¹ Some say that Sultan Nasir ud din killed his father by giving him poison. Sultān Naṣir ud dīn sent a message to Rānī Khurshīd that she should make over to the treasurer all the treasures of the Sultān which were in her possession otherwise she would suffer much trouble. The Rānī having regard to his probable harsh treatment brought over all the treasures and property which were hidden and concealed in the harem and made them over to the Naṣir Shahī agents.

The period of his (i.e. Sultān Ghīyath ud dīn's) reign was thirty two years and seventeen days.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN NĀSIR UD DĪN

Historians are agreed that the birth of Sultān Naṣir ud dīn took place during the reign of Sultān Mahmud Khaljī. Mahmud Shah and Ghīyath Shah in their great joy arranged festive entertainments and for one month kept the bed of pleasure and enjoyment spread out. In thanks giving for this great gift the ordinary *raiyats* generally and men of wisdom and deserving men specially were made participators in the board of their benefactions and the tables of their favours. Astrologers who knew the stars reported that the Shāhzāda was born with a happy fortune and in an auspicious moment and would get perfect nurture and full education from the nurse of the age and will be supreme and unrivalled in all the various arts and the different cultures and education. On the 7th day after the birth he was produced before the great and holy men and received the name of Abd ul qadir. Both in the time of his youth and in that of his manhood the marks of royalty and empire were patent.

¹ Col Briggs (vol IV p 240) thinks that the accusation is false as Naṣir ood Deen had been already crowned by his father's consent but the fact that many of the important nobles rebelled against Naṣir ud dīn would lead one to infer that the accusation had some foundation.

Frishtah and Col Briggs make it thirty three years.

and clear and bright on his forehead When he reached the years of discretion, and excelled all his contemporaries in the matter of the duties of leadership and chieftainship, Sultān Gḥhiyāth-ud-dīn made him his heir apparent, and entrusted the duties of the *vazārat* to him His younger brother, Shujā'at Kḥhān, although outwardly he did not forget any of the minutiae of agreement, still being hostile to him in spirit, got a number of men to combine with him One day he represented in private to Sultān Gḥhiyāth-ud-dīn that "A number of audacious, low men have collected in the service of Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn, and are inciting him to seize the kingdom It is better to remedy an event before it actually occurs" He made so many insinuations, that the intention of seizing the Shāhzāda and of imprisoning him became impressed on the Sultān's mind But as the marks of nobility and the token of sovereignty were evident in his countenance, his paternal affection induced him to apply the ointment of kindness and favour on the wound of his heart, and make him more powerful He accordingly ordered that the pay-master of the kingdom should send orders to the *am̄ins* and to heads of all bands, that they should go every morning to offer their salutation to Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn, and should attend at his stirrups to the palace gate

Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn now took up all the affairs of state permanently in his own hand, and appointed his own *gumāshtas* (his agents) everywhere As he allotted the management of the *Khāḷsa parganas* (i e, *parganas* in the direct possession of the sovereign) to Shaikh Habīb and Kḥhwājah Suhail eunuchs, ² Yakān Kḥhān and Amman and Mūnjā Baqāl, who had before this been the officers in charge of the *Khāḷsa* complained to Rānī Kḥhūrshīd, who was of a mannish disposition The latter as she was inclined towards Shujā'at Kḥhān, and her mind was not free from evil towards Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn, reported (to the Sultān) through Shujā'at Kḥhān that Malik Mahmūd *kōtwāl* and

¹ One MS has the text I have adopted, while the other omits the word Sultān Gḥhiyāth-ud-dīn, and the lith ed has روری در حلوب عیاب ساء معرمى and the lith ed has رسانید

² The names in the MSS are as I have given them here The lith ed omits Āman Firshtah lith ed has موتی حان, and مهن حان The names are not in any other history that I have seen

¹ Sev Das Bāqal who were the heads and chiefs of the rebels and traitors have become specially attached to Sultān Naṣir ud dīn and have made the lease of certain *maudas* appertaining to his *jagir* the pretext of their visits to him. Sultān Ghīyath ud dīn summoned Malik Mahmud and Sev Das and without asking them any questions and making any enquiries killed them and ravaged and destroyed the people in their houses.

- After this Sultān Naṣir ud dīn withdrew his hands from the duties of the ² *īzārat* and did not for some days attend to salute the Sultān Rānī Khurshid and Shuja at Khan having got an opportunity through the exertions and management of Yakan Khan and Munja Baqal spoke words full of interested suggestions in the garb of disinterestedness and having stretched their misappropriating hands to the treasury with a composed mind took upon themselves the full management of the affairs of the government. Owing to his great age Sultān Ghīyath ud dīn agreed to their doing so. But as he had heard from disinterested persons that Rānī Khurshid and Shuja at Khan wanted to calumniate and falsely accuse Sultān Naṣir ud dīn he waited to see their further proceedings. As Shaikh Habib ul lah and Khwajah Suhail knew that Mūnja Baqal was the prime mover in all this mischief and disturbance they waited for an opportunity and killed him and fled and went to the harem of Sultān Naṣir ud dīn. Rānī Khurshid narrated this story to Sultān Ghīyath ud dīn with much exaggeration and embroidery and on hearing of this occurrence the flame of the wrath of the Sultān blazed up and he sent a number of men with Yakan Khan that they might seize the murderers and

¹ The name is *سوداس* Sev Das and *سوداس* Sawī Dās and the lith ed has *سومداس* Som Das.

The account of the intrigues and fighting between Sultān Naṣir ud dīn and his partisans on the one side and Shuja at Khan and Rānī Khurshid and their adherents on the other which extends over several pages in the *Tabaqat* is dismissed in the course of some twenty lines by Col Briggs on pages 238-239 of vol IV of his history and also in some lines in the Cambridge History of India page 363.

² One MS has *وزار* and the other *مہمات* after *سفل* while the lith ed has neither the one nor the other. I have adopted *وزار*. In the text edition however it is *مہمات*.

¹ bring them out from the house of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. When he gave these men permission to go, he told them that they were on no account to forego any of the minutiae of respect and honour towards Nāṣir Shāh.

At this time Shaikh Habib-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail mounted their horses from Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's palace, and rode away to the open country. On the way they went on saying, "We are going to the house of the *Qādī*. Whoever wishes to make any complaint about the murder of Mūnjā Baqāl, let him appear there." Yakān Khān and the other *amīns* on arriving at the Nāṣir Shāhī *darbār* sent a message. The reply came, "Shaikh Habib-ul-lah and Khwājah Suhail did not kill Mūnjā Baqāl under my orders, and I do not know where they are gone." Yakān Khān did not accept this reply, and for three days kept the harem of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn under guard. When the Sultān knew that the murderers had fled, and giving further trouble to his son was wrong, he sent Mashūr-ul-mulk ² and Manhī Khān to him, and sent him a message to say that, "If my son's heart has not been aggrieved and the dust of pain has not clouded the seat of his mind, he should, as in former days, come to me, for I have no more strength to endure the pain of separation and estrangement."

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, ³ notwithstanding a hundred reasons for caution, obtained the honour of kissing the feet of his benefactor and father, and the father and the son washed off the dust of disturbance from the pages of the age with their tears. And Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn again became zealous in the Sultān's service, and every day saw fresh signs of the Sultān's affection towards him. He planned the building of a palace for his residence in the vicinity of the Ghīyāth Shāhī palace, so that he might always, when he wanted to do so, have the honour of waiting on his father. Rānī Khūrshīd took advantage of an opportunity one day, and said to the Sultān, "Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn has erected for himself a house close to the *Jahān-numā* palace, and

¹ One MS. has *بیارد*, the other has *بیاورد*, while the lith. ed. has *بیارد*.

² The name is *مہنی خان* Mahnī Khān, in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is *منتہی خان*, Mustahī Khān, while in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is *منتہی خان* Muntahī Khān.

³ *Firishtah* makes the matter clear by saying *وہد وعدہ*, لا وحوہ دم، in spite of fear of imprisonment, etc.

he apparently intends to act ¹ treacherously. Sultan Ghiyath ud din without any consideration or deliberation ordered Ghulib Khan *lotul* in the year 905 A.H. to destroy completely the Nasir Shah palace. Sultan Nasir ud din started the same night with a body of his adherents in the direction of Dhar which is situated in the forest of Kishun. Shaikh Habib ul lah and Khwajrah Suhail came there and waited on him. Rani Khurshid and Shuja at Khan sent an army in pursuit of him without giving any information to Sultan Ghiyath ud din of their having done so. But Sultan Ghiyath ud din sent Tatar Khan so that he might after conciliating Nasir Shah bring him back to the city. Tatar Khan left his men in the village of ² Bakankalu and went in company with Malik Fadl ul lah Bاده Mir Shikar to Sultan Nasir ud din and gave him his father's message. The latter wrote a petition which he gave to Tatar Khan and directed him that he should go and read it to the Sultan and bring his reply. The well intentioned Tatar Khan went on wings of speed to Shadiabad and reported the substance of the petition to Sultan Ghiyath ud din. But he had not yet received any reply when Rani Khurshid who had very great influence on the mind of the Sultan sent an order to the pny master of the empire that he should appoint Tatar Khan to attack and destroy Nasir ud din. When Tatar Khan became acquainted with these facts he came down from the fort and advanced towards ³ Barah.

The army which had been sent to attack Nasir Shah was on arrival at ⁴ Bakankalu puzzled and amazed about the result of their acts. (They knew) if they decided to fight they had reason to be afraid that when the turn of Nasir Shah came each one of them

¹ One MS has by mistake *عدری* instead of *عدری*.

Firishtah explains that Sultan Ghiyath ud din had on account of his great age lost his sense and intelligence.

² The name appears to be *بککالو* Bakankalu in the MSS and *بککالو* Bakbakalu in the lith ed. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *در کمنگاه* in some secret place. *ککالو* Kankanu is adopted in the text edition.

³ I cannot make out whether *بارة* or *مارة* is the name of a place or otherwise.

⁴ See note 3 above. At this place one MS has *بککالو* in the village of Bakankalu while the other has *بککالو* Bakankalu. The lith ed has *بککالو* in the village of kankalu.

would receive capital punishment, and if they went back to Mandū they were afraid of punishment by Rānī Khūrshīd in the immediate future. They were still wandering in the plains of amazement when they heard that Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn had left that place and had marched to and encamped in the town of ¹ Thahnah. At this station, Malīk Mahta and Malīk Haibat, who were among the great *amīns* of ² the Ghīyāth Shāhī state came and joined him, and the power and splendour of Nāsir Shāh were much increased. From that station he moved to the town of ³ Rājāwīyah, and Maulānā ‘Imād-ud-dīn Afdal Khān and a body of the *zamīndārs* ⁴ of that neighbourhood joined him there. He stayed there for a few days on account of the pleasant nature of the air, and the freshness and verdure of the fields, and had, with the consent of the *amīns* the royal umbrella raised over his head, on the day of the ‘*Īd-i-ḥiṭī*’ (the festivity of the breaking of the fast), and distinguished the *amīns* and divines and heads of groups by bestowing valuable robes of honour on them.

At this time news was brought to him, that Shujā‘at Khān’s troops had started from the village of ⁵ Bakankālū with the intention of giving battle, and had arrived in the village of ⁶ Kandūyah.

¹ The name looks like تهنه Tahnah or نهنه Natnah in the MSS, and بهایه Bhaliah in the lith. ed. M. Hidayat Hosain has هاسته Hastah in the text-edition.

² One MS. has دولت عیاب الدین شاهى, while the other and the lith. ed. have دولت عیاب شاهى.

³ The name is راجاوه Rājāwīyah, in both MSS, while the lith. ed. has اراجاه Ajārnah, and the lith. ed. of Firishtah has حادیه Jādīah. M. Hidayat Hosain has اجایه Ajāīyah in the text edition.

⁴ The reading in one MS. is رمین داران ان ناحیه which I have adopted. The other MS. has الحنه Alhanah and the lith. ed. has ریکته Rēkhtah instead of ان ناحیه. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has بعضی ارمنداران, some *zamīndārs*.

⁵ The name is here written as کنکاتو Kankātū in one MS. and کیکالو Kīkālū in the other, and نککالو Bakikālū in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has here کنکاو Kankānū.

⁶ The name appears to be کندویه Kandūyah in the MS, and کندوبه Kandūbah in the lith. ed. In later passages it is written as کندویه Kandūyah in the MS, and I have adopted that name. Firishtah lith. ed. has کندوهر Kandūhar.

Nasir Shah sent ¹ Malik Malhu to chastise them. As the star of his fortune had become resplendent over the horizon of greatness when the two armies met the breeze of victory and triumph blew over the plumes of Malik Malhu's standard and the enemy fled and went to Mandu and Malik Malhu joined Nasir Shah's camp at Rajawiyah with much booty. On the 16th Shawwal in the year 905 A H 1499 A D he marched from that station towards the town of - Ajud Mubarak Khan and ² Himmat Khan now came and joined him. And when he arrived in the town of Sundarsi Rustam Khan the governor of Sarangpur came and waited on him and brought some elephants and much other property as a tribute. After his arrival at Ujjain *amirs* and *fauj-dars* and *thanadars* came to his threshold in great numbers. Rani Khurshid and Shuja at Khan (now) in fear of their lives reported to Sultan Chiyath ud din that Nasir Shah had arrived at Ujjain and all the *amirs* and *thanadars* had turned to him and the fort of Shadiabad would be besieged in the near future.

Chiyath ud din sent Shaikh Auliya and Shaikh Burhan ud din as ambassadors and sent the following message through them. It is a long time since I have placed the bridle of the work of government in the grasp of my son's hand of power. If acting in a spirit of sincerity and attachment he would send away the mob of common people which has collected round him and would come and wait on me the affairs of the empire would again be entrusted to his penetrating intellect and judicious consideration. At that time if he considers it advisable he can allot the territory of Ranthambhōr to Shuja at Khan who stands in the relation of a son to him and the flame of disturbance and revolt should be extinguished by the waters of peace. Nasir Shah did not bind himself by any reply and towards the end of Dhī qā dah of the aforesaid year marched from the town of Ujjain to the town of Dhar and halted there for some days. About this time

¹ That is the name in both MSS and in the lith ed but Firihāt alith ed has ملک محمود Malik Mahmud.

² One MS and the lith ed have the reading I have in the text but the other MS has بنو و راو موجود گسب instead of بنو و راو موجود گسب. M. Hidayat Hoain has adopted احود Ajud for او حود in the text edition.

³ The name is همای خان and همب خان in the MSS and معین خان without any dot above or below the third letter in the lith ed. Firihāt alith ed does not name these men.

news came that ¹ Yakān Khān had come down from Shādiābād, with three thousand horsemen, with the intention of giving battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Malik ² 'Aṭan was sent with five hundred horsemen to the village of Hānspūr. Yakān Khān receiving information of this advanced towards Hānspūr. After a fight between them, Malik 'Aṭan was victorious, and ³ one hundred brave men out of Yakān Khān's troops, who knew men, were slain. Malik 'Aṭan seized eighty horses and much booty, and returned to the town of Dhāi. Yakān Khān with the men who had escaped the sword fled and entered the fort. After a few days, Yakān Khān, at the incitement of Rānī Khūrshīd and Shujā'at Khān, again came out of the fort with a body of men whom he had got together, with the determination of fighting another battle. Immediately on hearing this news, Nāṣir Shāh nominated Khwājah ⁴ Suhail and Malik Mahta and Malik Haibat and Miyān Jiw to attack and crush Yakān Khān, but as soon as the eyes of the latter fell on Nāṣir Shāh's troops, his foot of firmness and stability slipped, and he fled without attempting to fight, and, in short, wherever the two sides met, the breezes of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Nāṣir Shāh's standards.

On the 22nd of Dhī'l-hijja'ul-haiām of the aforesaid year, (Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn) took up his quarters in the *Jahān-numā* ⁵ palace at

¹ See note 2, page 554. Here the name is لکان حان without any dot above or below the first letter in one MS. and یکان حان in the other MS., and نکان حان in the lith. ed. Firishtah lith. ed. has مکھن حان as before, and describes him as the مَادَةُ فِتْنَةٍ و بَرَاعِ or the cause of all disturbance and dispute. I have adopted یکان حان.

² He is so called in both MSS. The lith. ed. has ملک اٹا ارسلان. The name of the village is هانسنور Hānspūr in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, لپور ها Hānsalpūr in the other MS. and هانسلور Hānslūr in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqāt.

³ The MSS. and the lith. ed. all have یکصد نفر مردانہ مردم سناس. I do not understand the exact meaning of these words. Firishtah simply has یکصد سناہی مکھن حان.

⁴ The names are as I have got them in the text in one MS. There are slight differences as regards the second and the fourth in the other MS. and in the lith. ed. Firishtah does not give the names, though he mentions the second attempt.

⁵ One MS. has کوسک, while the other MS. and the lith. ed. have کوسک.

Na Icha At this station his spies brought the news that Sultān Ghīyath ud din in his old elegant person intended to come in order to comfort and counsel his son (i.e. Nasir ud din) and in order to carry out this intention he had moved from the capital and had taken up his residence ¹ in the centre of the kingdom and he would move from the place at a moment which the astrologers had selected and after trying to please his son's heart he would return to Shadiabad. Nasir Shah was pleased and delighted on hearing this news and waited in expectation of the joy giving arrival of his father but Shuja at Khan with the advice of Rani Khurshid had the Sultān's litter taken up and had it carried towards Na Icha. When they arrived at the Dehligate and as age and senility had overcome the Sultān he asked those who were near him where they were taking him to. Some of them informed him of what had happened. He said I will go another day. You should turn back to day. The servants having no alternative turned back. When Rani Khurshid heard that Sultān Ghīyath ud din had returned from the way she knew that this had happened at the incitement of Nasir Shah's well wishers. She summoned the men into her presence and having used harsh words towards them demanded the reason of their action. They said that the Sultān had returned according to his own wishes and no one else had any hand in the matter.

Shuja at Khan then with the advice and consent of Rani Khurshid repaired the broken and ruined parts of the fort and distributed the bastions (among his commanders). Nasir Shah also advanced from his position and arranged batteries round the fort. Every day numbers of men were slain from each side. Sultān Ghīyath ud din sent the ablest of the judges Mashir ul mulk to arrange for peace but as he did not get a reply like what he wanted and was afraid of Rani Khurshid he remained where he was. As the siege became close and the garrison was in great anxiety and distress owing to the non arrival of grain and other necessities and bearing in mind the purport of the text that change is best even though it may go against us directed their attention to this that the office of the Sultān

¹ The actual words are مقام عرض ممالک I cannot find out the exact meaning of the first two words

be fixed on Nāṣir Shāh Amongst the *amīns*, who were still in the fort, Muwāfiq Khān and Malik Fadl-ul-lah, *Mīr Shikār*, (chief huntsman) availing themselves of an opportunity betook themselves to the service of Nāṣir Shāh The latter bestowed a *lakh* of *tankas* on Muwāfiq Khān When Rānī Khūrshid and Shujā'at Khān received information of this, they dismissed 'Ali Khān from the charge of the fort, and made over the guarding of the fort and the government of the city to Malik Piyārā, on whom they conferred the title of 'Ali Khān They also sentenced ¹ Muhāfiz Khān and Sūrajmal to death The *amīns* and the great men and all the residents of the city became heartbroken on seeing this punishment, and sent petition to Nāṣir Shāh, and prayed for permits of protection After a few days the siege was carried on to such a point, that among the garrison, nothing was left of any grain except the name, and many people came out of the fort on account of the famine

Nāṣir Shāh mounted his horse on the night of 18th Safar in the year 906 A H, with the object of capturing the fort When he arrived close to the fort, the men in the bastions came up and shot arrows and musket shots, and many active and brave warriors were wounded In the end Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn advanced towards the bastion of seven hundred steps Dilāwar Khān Jangjū to his great honour, managed to get into the fort Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn also entered the fort Shujā'at Khān, with a number of trusted men, came out on a turret of the fort, and exerted himself, and showed great bravery Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, in his own elegant person, shot many arrows, and ² many men fell under his arrows of fate As reinforcements reached Shujā'at Khān time after time, and brave warriors belonging to Nāṣir Khān's army received wounds, the latter thinking it advisable to return came out of the fort to his own camp He bestowed much favour and kindness on the men who had exerted themselves, and offered their lives in his service and comforted them by bestowing new robes of honour, and enquired about their health and condition

¹ Firishtah explains که از موافقان سلطان ناصرالدین خلجی میدانست, i.e., whom they knew to be partisans of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn Khālji

² The actual words are مردم حوب تر سر تر و صاء او رفتند The meaning is not very clear, but I think my translation is correct Firishtah in the corresponding passage has مردم خود نیز مصای او در گذشتند

After some days the sons of Sher Khan son of Muzaffar Khan the governor of Chanderi came and joined the camp of Nasir Shah with one thousand horsemen and eleven elephants. In the first *majlis* after their arrival Nasir Shah conferred the title of Muzaffar Khan on the elder and As d Khan on the second son. Owing to the arrival of the army of Chanderi new vigour and strength appeared in the men of the army. At this time some men in the garrison of Mandu who had the charge of guarding the ¹ Malpur gate sent a notice to the besieging army that if Nasir Shah's troops came in that direction the fort will come to his possession without any difficulty or trouble. Sultan Nasir Shah sent Mubarak Khan and Shaukh Habib ul lah and Muwafiq Khan and Khwaja Suhul and a number of others on the night of the 24th of Rabi' ul akhbir of the afore mentioned year. Shaukh Habib ul lah told them that if they succeeded in capturing the fort he would send his ring that they might know that the fort had come into their possession. When the *amirs* reached the gate the citizens in concert with Zabardast Khan son of Hazbar Khan who had charge of the *silakhkhana* (armoury) of the fort slew the keeper of the Malpur gate and opened it and Nasir Shah's men galloped into the fort.

Shuja at Khan with his army in battle array advanced to fight but was unable to do anything and fled and got into his own house and then taking his family and children with him retired into the harem of Sultan Ghiyath ud din. Shaukh Habib ul lah then according to previous arrangement sent his ring and brought Nasir Shah in. He reached the Malpur gate in a moment and got into the city. The *amirs* hastened to wait on him and offered their congratulations. Some foolish men set fire to some of the palaces and mansions of Sultan Ghiyath ud din without any order from Nasir Shah and they seized and brought Shuja at Khan and Rani Khurshid and some other persons and having commenced to plunder and ransack the city devastated it for two days. Sultan Ghiyath ud din then made up his mind and formed a determination and moved from the place to the palace of Sarsati and took up his abode there.

¹ One of the MSS has بالپور Balpur instead of مالپور Malpur. The Cambridge History of India page 363 calls it the Balapur gate.

One MS and the lith ed have بی امر ناصر سامی while the other MS has بی امر و حکم ناصر سامی.

On the 31d day, which was ¹ Friday the 27th of Rabi'-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn sat on the throne of the empire and ² made over Shujā'at Khān and Rānī Khūrshīd to custodians. He sent Malik Mahta to Na'icha (to bring) his ³ second son, who was known as Miyān Manjha, and making the latter his heir, conferred on him the title of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. He allotted to him the *Safa Bāgh*, which was situated near the palace of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn as his residence. The same day the *Khutba* was read in the name of Nāsir Shāh, and pearls and other gems, which were showered over his umbrella, were distributed among deserving men. Yakān Khān and Amman and Muhāfiz Khān Jadīd and Mufarraḥ Pīdai Habshī and other men, who had been hostile to him, were punished with death, and some men were brought away from under the sword, and were kept in imprisonment. According to the established custom he confirmed fiefs ⁴ on the men who had sided with him. He conferred on Shaikh Habīb-ul-lah the title of 'Ālam Khān, and to Khwājah Suhail to whom he ⁵ had given the *parwana* of Āshtah, he gave the post of *Sipahsālārī* (office of commander-in-chief). On the 3rd of Jamādī-ul-ākhir of the afore-mentioned year, Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn was honoured by being allowed to do homage to his father and benefactor Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn. The latter took him into his arms, and wept a great deal, and kissed his head and face, and on giving him permission to retire, bestowed on him the cap of state and the

¹ Firishtah lith. ed. gives the same day and date. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 240) also has Rubbee oos Sany 27, A H 906, October 25, A D 1500, as the date of Sultan Nasir-ood-Deen's accession. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, has October 22nd, 1500.

² Nizām ud-dīn does not appear to mention the execution of Shujā'at Khān but Firishtah mentions it. See note 1, page 552. Col Briggs says Shoojat Khan and "all his children and the whole of his family" were put to death. The Cambridge History of India, page 363, also says that Shujā'at Khān was put to death.

³ Neither Nizām-ud-dīn nor Firishtah gives any reason for the selection of the second son as the heir-apparent in preference to the eldest son, or whether the latter was dead or otherwise disqualified.

⁴ One MS. inserts *و ابهاعت سیم حبیب الله را* before

⁵ One MS. omits *که* and *بود*, and the other has *برگه که داشته داده*.

¹ robe of woven hair which he used himself to wear on the days of public audience and other auspicious days and placing the royal crown on his head made over to him the keys of the treasury and offering him felicitations and congratulations bade him adieu

On the 16th of Rajab of the afore said year he bestowed on Sultān Shihab ud din the same fur cloth robe and the cap of state and also gave him twenty elephants and one hundred horses and eleven royal umbrellas two *palkis* and also a standard and a kettle drum and a red pavilion and twenty *lalkhs* of *tankas* for his household expenses

After a few days Muqbil Khan the governor of Mandisor fled owing to his extreme misfortune and Mahabat Khan in whose charge he was was sent immediately that he might seize and bring him back with the threat that otherwise he should expect the thunderbolts of punishment Mahabat Khan made great exertions but (being unsuccessful) went and joined Sher Khan (the governor of Chanderi)

Ali Khan and some other men of evil destiny who were suspicious and afraid owing to their evil deeds also went and joined Sher Khan The latter marched from the neighbourhood of Naich and advanced towards Chanderi Sultan Nasir ud din sent Mubarak Khan and Alam Khan to Sher Khan so that they might in any way that they

could reassure him Although they gave him words of sage counsel he spoke rare words in answer to all their arguments and wanted to imprison both of them On the pretext that he was going to consult

¹ The lith ed has *کلاه دوله* before *عباى موبنه* which however is printed as *عباى سرنه* in it The MSS omit *کلاه دوله* though they mention it a little later I have therefore retained it *عابه* appears to mean made of woven cloth of hair and Firishtah explains the importance of sanctity of this robe by saying *از باب سند محمد نور بخش* i.e. appertaining to Sayyid Muhammad Nur Bakhs

Firishtah says *نبرد و زرد* but like Nizam ud din he gives no reason for this Col Briggs quotes in a note (vol IV p 241) some of the intrigues and fighting between Nasir ood Deen on the one side and Shoojat Khan and Rany Khooorshed on the other from the Muntukhib oot Towareekh and says the o are not mentioned by Ferishta although as a matter of fact they are The Cambridge History of India page 364 says that the *amirs* declined to believe that Sultan Nasir ud din had ascended the throne with his father's consent and therefore rebelled Firishtah does not say that Muqbil Khan was in charge of Mahabat Khan He however agrees with the text in saying that he was sent to bring the latter

with his mother, he came out of the pavilion, and made over Mubārak Khān and 'Ālam Khān to his own men. The latter seized Mubārak Khān, and slew two of his servants. 'Ālam Khān took the opportunity to get to his horse, and with great quickness came out of the camp, and reported the matter to Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. The latter left his son Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, in charge of the government of the fort of Shādīābād, and took up his quarters, on the 9th Sha'bān of the afore-mentioned year, in the *Jahān-numā* palace at Na'icha. When Shēr Khān arrived in the fort of Ujjain, he again, at the instigation of Mahābat Khān turned back to give battle, and came to Dibālpūr, and plundered the town of Hindīah. Immediately on hearing this, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn marched forward, and took up his residence in the palace of Dhār.

At this time they brought the news that Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn had passed away from the waste place of the world to the popular land of after-world. According to one statement he was poisoned at the instance of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn. ¹ It is a matter of experience that a parricide never attains to old age and never becomes successful. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn ruled for ² eleven years. Therefore the allegation of his attempt on the life of his father may be a mere calumny, but knowledge is with God alone.

In short, Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn wept much at the death of his father, and was in mourning for three days. ³ On the 4th day he

¹ Firishtah gives the same reason for disbelieving the guilt of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, but he is not so positive as Nizām-ud-dīn as he prefixes the word *شك* perhaps, to the sentence about Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's innocence. Col Briggs thinks that it is not just to accuse him of that crime, while the Cambridge History of India (p. 364) says that the poison was "administered, as it was generally believed, by his orders." One would have thought, that seeing that the father was so weak in body and mind, and so helpless, it would be futile and unnecessary to cause his death, but there is the fact that some of the nobles rebelled, because they believed that Nāṣir-ud-dīn had not ascended the throne with his father's consent.

² Both MSS have *سنة 13* 13 years, but the lith. ed. has *سنة 11* 11 years. Firishtah lith. ed. has many years. As Nāṣir-ud-dīn's reign lasted from 905 to 916 A.H., the reading in the lith. ed. is correct and I have retained it.

³ Firishtah lith. ed. agrees generally with the text as to the Sultān's proceeding against Shēr Khān. Col Briggs however (vol. IV, p. 241) says

started on his march and Sher Khan in ¹ fear of his life turned back to his own country. Ain ul mulk and some other *sardars* separated from him and joined the camp of ² Nasir Shah. The latter pursued Sher Khan and the latter turned back in the neighbourhood of Sarangpūr to engage him and after doing so fled. He could not stand firm in Chandern itself and went away to the country of Frj and Bhandir and the dust of the disturbance settled down and Sulṭān Naṣir ud din went to Chandern. When some days had passed the Shaikhzadas of Chandern sent a letter to Sher Khan saying that as most of the Shadiabad troops had dispersed and had gone away to their *jagirs* and as owing to the rains the *amirs* would not be able to assemble quickly if he would come to Chandern and the men of the city should in conjunction with him come out in great numbers it was probable that they would be able to seize Sultan Naṣir ud din and even if he should escape the city could be conquered in a very easy way. Sher Khan without any delay marched out and arrived within six *karohs* of Chandern. Sulṭān Naṣir ud din ³ became acquainted with the consultations of the Shaikhzadas and appointed Iqbal Khan and Mallu Khan with a well equipped army and *many* elephants to get rid of Sher Khan and sent two *lakhs* of *tanlas* in cash with them to defray their expenses. They had not yet gone two *karohs* when Sher Khan relying on the statements of

that Sher Khan's adherents wrote to him that the King had retreated to Mando on account of the rains. This is not correct. The Cambridge History of India page 364 says that After an unsuccessful attempt to crush this rebellion and another attempt equally unsuccessful to conciliate the rebels he took the field against them. This also is incorrect if Nizam ud din and Firishtah are correct. Neither of them speaks of the first unsuccessful attempt to crush the rebellion.

¹ Both MSS have *وهم حان* which I have adopted but the lith ed has *بهم حان*.

The MSS have Nasir Shah and Nasir Shahi and the lith ed has Nasir ud din.

³ The MSS as well as the lith ed have *اطلاع بمودة* which does not appear to be quite correct. Firishtah lith ed has *اطلاع بامده* which is better and I have adopted it. In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has retained *اطلاع بمودة*.

the Shaikhzādas came forward to meet them, and after the arraying of the troops the two sides fought bravely. In the midst of the struggle, Shēr Khān happened to receive a wound, became disabled, and ¹ got the fruit of his rebellion. ² Sikandar Khān was killed in the battle-field. Khwājah Suhail and Mahābat Khān placed the wounded Shēr Khān in a box (some sort of *howdah*) on the back of an elephant and took the way of flight. As Shēr Khān died on the way, they buried him, and went on in their flight. Iqbāl Khān returned after pursuing them for some distance. Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn was delighted and pleased on hearing this news, and went to the battle-field, and ³ from there sent Sikandar Khān to Chandēri, so that he might expose Shēr Khān's body on a gallows. He placed the bridle of the government and defence of that territory in the grasp of power of ⁴ Bihjat Khān, and marching by successive stages arrived in the pleasant town of ⁵ Sa'dulpūr. There some men reported to him, that Shaikh Habīb-ul-lah, ⁶ who had the title of 'Ālam Khān, intended to act treacherously, and was waiting for an opportunity. Sultān

¹ The words in one MS and in the lith ed are و نبيعه يعى كار حود كرد. The other MS incorrectly omits the verb كرد, but in either case the meaning is rather obscure. I think, however, my translation is correct. Firishtah lith ed in the corresponding passage omits this semi-moral observation.

² It is not stated who he was. Firishtah in the corresponding passage says كه عمدۀ ان قوم بود. Firishtah agrees generally with the text in respect of the battle and the incidents preceding and following it, and so do Col Briggs and the Cambridge History of India.

³ Firishtah differs slightly, and says that the Sultān went to the battle field, exhumed Shēr Khān's body, and sent it to Chandēri, so that it might be suspended from the gallows there.

⁴ Col Briggs (vol IV, p 242) calls him Himmūt Khan, and the Cambridge History of India, page 364, has Bihjat Khān.

⁵ Col Briggs (vol IV, p 242) calls the place Adilpoor. It is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

⁶ The actual words are نسبت به عالم خان in both MSS and in the lith ed. I do not actually understand the meaning of the word نسبت in this context, Firishtah has in the corresponding passage شيخ حبيب الله المعاطب به عالم خان which is perfectly clear, and I have translated the passage accordingly. M Hidayat Hosain has retained the reading of the manuscripts, but refers to a variant ملقب instead of نسبت in another MS.

Nasir ud din imprisoned him and sent him to Mandu in advance of himself

On the 10th Sha ban 907 A H he entered the fort of Shadiabad attended with victory and triumph. He then occupied himself with pleasure and dissipation and most of his time was spent in the drinking of spirituous liquor. In his drinks he ordered his father's amirs to be murdered owing to a suspicion of their treachery and he supported and favoured his own men. His immorality and tyranny reached such a pitch that one day when drunk he was asleep on the bank of a reservoir. By accident he fell into it. His attendants who were watching him brought him out of the water. When he came to his senses he asked who had taken him out. Four slave girls told him. We performed this service. He ordered all four of them to be executed. He had heard from the chief men of Ujjain (apparently the reservoir was in that city and this incident occurred there) that that reservoir or tank was the Kalivadah. He planned the erection of a palace there in the *Bagh Firu* of such grandeur that people who had travelled over the inhabited fourth part of earth never saw anything like it. Gradually his desire for building reached such a point that out of the seventeen *lros* of Malwa money which had come to him by inheritance he spent five *lros* on different structures.

On the 22nd Dhi qa dah 908 A H he came to the town of Na lcha with the intention of destroying the country of ³ Kachwarah. And

¹ Firishtah narrates this incident in greater detail. According to him the Sultān rolled into the water and the four slave girl pulled him out some seizing hold of his hands and the others the hair of his head. They all put him into dry clothes. When he recovered his senses he complained of headache and the slave girl hoping for a reward told him what had happened after the usual prayers and praise he flew into a rage drew his sword and cut down the poor and helpless slave girl. And then Firishtah indulges in three couplets expressing the woes of the hapless women and their having their revenge on the day of resurrection.

Firish tah does not mention the erection of the wonderful palace and the other buildings.

³ The name is written as كچهوارا and كچهوارا in the MS and كچهوار in the lith ed both of the Tabakat and of Firishtah. Col Briggs (vol IV p 243) has Keechuware. The Cambridge History of India does not mention this invasion at all.

when by successive marches, he arrived in the town of ¹ Āgar, he found the air of that place to be pleasant, and built a lofty and ² noble palace there which is now one of the wonders of the age. He remained in that town for some time, and sent his troops in different directions, and having chastised the rebels and taken tribute from them, returned (to his capital)

In the year 909 A H, 1803 A D, he again moved in the direction of ³ Chitōi, and when he arrived in the centre of the country, the Rāja of Chitōr and all the *zamīndārs* sent tribute. ⁴ Bhawānīdās, the son of Shevdās, who was a near relation of Rāymal Chitōi brought his daughter as tribute. Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn gave her the title of Rānī Chitōi, and bestowed many favours on Bhawānīdās. In the course of the Sultān's return, scouts brought the news, that Nizām-ul-mulk Dakinī had invaded the country of Asir and Burhānpūr. As Dāūd Khān, the ruler of Asir, had always sought the protection of Nāṣir Shāh, the latter sent Iqbāl Khān and Khwājah Jahān to Asir and Burhānpūr. Nizām-ul-mulk then turned back and returned to his own country. Iqbāl Khān had the public prayer read in Asir and Burhānpūr in the name of Nāṣir Shāh, and returned to the capital city of Shādīābād Mandū.

In the year ⁵ 916 A H, 1512 A D, Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn raised the standard of rebellion at the instigation of some of the *amīrs* of

¹ The name is written as اكر and اكره in the MS, and اكر and اكره in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt and Firishtah. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 243) calls the place Akburpoor. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the place here but later on (p 367) it calls it Āgar.

² One MS omits the word عمارت after عالي.

³ The MSS and the lith ed and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 243) all have Chittoor, but the lith ed of Firishtah has Jaipūr. The Cambridge History of India, page 364, says the Sultān in 1503 "led a marauding expedition into the dominion of the Rānā", but does not mention the place.

⁴ He is so described in the MSS as well as in the lith ed, but the lith ed of Firishtah calls him راجا فریب داشت. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 243) has "Raja Jewundas, one of the subordinate rays." The Cambridge History of India has not mentioned it. Firishtah lith ed says the daughter of Jhūdās was named Rānī Jaipūrī, but Col Briggs says that she was afterwards dignified with the title of the "Chittoor Queen."

⁵ The Cambridge History of India, page 364, gives 1510 A D, as the year of the rebellion.

perverted destiny and came out of the fort of Mandu. The *amirs* of the frontier districts mostly joined him and he marched from the town of Na'icha to the town of Dhar. Sultān Na'ir ud-din arrived there with a body of his special troops and from that place he advanced towards Dhar with the intention of giving battle. Sultān Shihab ud-din considering that his father's followers were weak advanced to engage him but in the end the breeze of victory and triumph blew on the plumes of Na'ir Shāh's standards. Sultān Shihab ud-din fled towards Chanderi. The brave warriors in Na'ir Shāh's army pursued him and were about to take him prisoner but (on account of) fatherly love and paternal affection (he) forbade the men from further pursuit.

On the following day he marched from that station and went forward. When Sultān Shihab ud-din arrived in the town of ¹Sipri Sultān Na'ir ud-din sent a number of wise men to him so that they might instruct him and lead him from the by-path of error to the high road of guidance. But as the way of righteousness was hidden from his side and the veil of negligence and of the love of splendour had been drawn down on his eye he never gave a reply that might be of any use. On the following day he sent a reply. At present his shame and self-abasement prevent his acquiring the good fortune of waiting on Your Majesty. If a small part out of the many portions of the empire be bestowed on this slave he would after a few days honour himself by rendering homage. When the men who had been sent knew that it would be impossible to bring about an interview they came back and reported the matter. Sultān Na'ir ud-din said: Verily we are for God and verily we shall return to him.

Hemstich

The soil devoured the seed that in hope of thee I sowed.

He then sent a *farman* to Ranthambhor to summon Azam Humayun his younger son. The latter came on wings of speed and steps of eagerness and waited on his father near Chanderi. Sultān

¹ The name of the place is written as *سپری* in one or two places in the MSS. and in the lith. ed. but *سپری* in the other place. The Cambridge History of India, page 364 also has *Sipri*. The lith. ed. and C. I. Briggs (x. 1. iv. p. 44) both have Delhi in text and *Sipri*. This of course is incorrect.

Nāṣir-ud-dīn started from Chandēī on the following day and advanced to the town of Sīpī. At that station, he ordered the attendance of the *amīns* and the great men of the city, and said, "As Shihāb-ud-dīn has made undutifulness and revolt the return for paternal love, I am removing him from the position of the heir apparent, and I am making my son Ā'zam Humāyūn my heir." He then gave him the title of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, and bestowed a robe and the crown of the empire on him, and returning from the town of Sīpī resided for some days in the village of ¹ Behīshpūr. ² As the temperature of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn was high and as in spite of the fact of its being the winter, he got into cold water and remained in it for a moment, his health immediately turned from the normal, and various diseases and ailments with mutually opposed results attacked him. Although the physicians tried to effect a cure, they had no success.

Couplet

³ Oxymeral, by fate's decree, increased his bile,
The oil of almonds divinity produced

Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, seeing that his condition was unsatisfactory sent for Mahmūd Shāh, and the *amīns* and the great men of the country to his presence and opening his lips to give utterance to counsels and precepts said: "⁴ As the great and holy God has selected this excellent

¹ The name is *بہشت نور* in the MSS and in the lith. ed. of Firsihtah, and *بہت نور* in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt*. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 244) has Burtpoor. The name of the place is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

² Firsihtah's account agrees with that in the text, but he surmises that the fever was caused *ارافراط شراب یا ارعقوت احلاط و تصرف هوا*, i.e., from excessive drinking or from infection of the humours of the body or the influence of the air. Col Briggs's account (so far it goes) agrees with that in the text. The Cambridge History of India, pages 364, 365, gives two accounts of the manner of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn's death. The first agrees with that in the text. According to the other he suspected many of his nobles to be secretly in correspondence with Shihāb-ud-dīn, and threatened them, so that they became apprehensive and poisoned him. I have not seen this said anywhere else.

³ A mixture of honey and vinegar prescribed for the bile.

⁴ Firsihtah does not ascribe any speech to the Sultān, and considering the latter's disposition and habits, and his condition at the time, it is not likely that he could make such a sensible and eloquent address. However, as it is there, I have translated it.

son (of mine) from the entire people of the world and has entrusted the bridle of the affairs of all people to his grasp of power it behoves him that he should not place his foot out of the high road of worship of and submission to God and should not become subject to lust and sensuality and should write the text of love to the people of God on the leaf of his mind and the page of his heart. He should also not withhold the favour of God from the people as it has not been withheld from him. He should also shorten his hand from the skirts of the oppressed. He should not in his public audiences give way to hesitation and weariness and should not close the path of approach of the oppressed to him and should properly listen to their words. He should not also in administering justice and equity allow any difference between the weak and the strong and the high and the low so that he may not become ashamed on the day of the judgment. He should also treat with honour and respect all Suids who are the fruits of the garden of the prophethood and of the emissary of God and should make the high society of the learned who are the heirs of the prophet green and fruitful by the beneficence of the clouds of his rewards. He should also consider it right and proper to refrain from the society of stupid and foolish men who are satisfied with husk of words and are ignorant and unmindful of the purity and greatness of saints. He should also lay the foundation of houses of piety and goodness which are the effects of one's good fortune in all parts of the dominions. In short he should devote all his energy in carrying out the wishes of God and in the administration of the affairs of the state always take counsel (with wise men). Shahzadah Mahmud Shah and the great men of the kingdom were in great pain and anguish on hearing this speech. (The Sultan) then with a true determination and a right resolution made repentance of all his sins and iniquities in the presence of the learned men and after a moment accepted the summons of the just God. The period of his reign was eleven years and four months and twenty¹ three days.

Couplets

From the cold earth rose this palace grand

But as you make it warm they tell you rise !

¹ Firishtah lith ed has eleven years and four months and three days and Col Briggs (vol IV p 44) has eleven years and four months

As this world of dust has such foundations weak,
Soon should it be scattered to the wings, and ruin be

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD SHĀH, SON OF NĀSIR SHĀH

On the ¹ 3rd day of Safar in the year 917 A H, Mahmūd Shāh, the son of Nāsir Shāh, ascended the throne of the Khaljī empire, in the village of Behishtpūr, with ² an auspicious and triumphant fortune and at a happy time. The rites of thanks-offering and of wave-offering having been performed, each one of the great men of the age was made happy with royal beneficence, and from the same *maḡlis* sent the coffin of Nāsir Shāh to the fort of Shādīābād.

³ Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn on becoming acquainted with the event (*Hādītha*, i.e., probably his father's death), betook himself from where he was by rapid marches, to Nasratābād Na'lcha. Muhāfiz Khān Khwājah Sarā and Khawās Khān shut the gates in his face. On the following day, he sent a message to them, by one of his immediate attendants, that if they would act in friendship with him, it ⁴ was certain, that the loosening and fastening of the affairs of the state would be entrusted to their wisdom. Muhāfiz Khān and Khawās Khān said, "As the ordinance of the empire, has been recorded in

¹ Neither Firishtah nor Col Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India gives the date of the accession.

² There is some difference in the readings. One MS has بطالع مرقده فیروز. This I have adopted. The other MS substitutes مرقده فیروز. The lith ed has بطالع مرقده فیروز در زمان سعادت اثر.

³ The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says "Shihāb-ud-dīn, on hearing of his father's death, returned to Mālwa and marched on Māndū, but Mahmud II outstripped him and arrived there first, and when Shihāb-ud-dīn reached the city, the gates were shut in his face." This appears to me to contain more than one inaccuracy. There was no race between the brothers, and it was the gates of Na'lcha and not of Māndū that were shut in Shihāb-ud-dīn's face by Muhāfiz Khān, who was the governor of the former place and not of the latter. It is true that Col Briggs also says that the gates of Mando were shut in his face and Muhāfiz Khān refused him admission. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 246) also says that immediately after this the Prince "fled to Aseer", and says nothing about his defeat by Jāwash Khān. The Cambridge History of India appears here to follow Col Briggs and does not refer to the Tabaqāt or Firishtah at all.

⁴ Both MSS omit است after بقی, but I have retained it.

the renowned name of Mahmud Shah in the office of destiny and fate the best course is that you should join the camp (of Sultān Mahmud) and should change the foulness and roughness of a strange man for the purity of friendship ¹ Sultān Shihab ud din becoming despondent retired towards Kandasah ² When Sultān Mahmud knew that Sultān Shihab ud din had gone away towards Mandu he marched by successive stages and took up his residence in *Jahan numa* house of Nalcha on the 2nd Rabi ul awwal of the afore mentioned year

From there he sent ³ Jawahar Khan with a detachment of troops to crush Sultān Shihab ud din and he sent eleven elephants with him He then went to the fort of Shadabad on a date which had been selected by the astrologers and at an auspicious moment on the 6th Rabi ul awwal had the golden throne encrusted with gems and pomegranate colour rubies in the open plain near the audience hall and ⁴ had twenty one other thrones raised around it and Mahmud Shah ascended the throne of the Khalij Sultāns from the east of the

¹ One MS omits the whole sentence from سلطان to سد The name of the place is کندوه Kandulah in the MS which has the sentence and کندوه Kanduyah in the lith ed Firishtah is very brief here and does not mention the place

There is much difference in the reading One MS has سلطان محمود بندوق etc while the other has سلطان رد و اف سد که سلطان سہاب الدین بندوق etc and the lith ed has سلطان محمود حوس و اف سد کہ سلطان سہاب الدین بندوق etc The reading in the first MS is manifestly incorrect and there is not much to choose between the other two but on the whole I think the reading of the lith ed is the best

³ The name is خاوس حان in one MS and in several places in the other In the latter it is حلوس حان in one place The lith ed has حاوس حان The expedition against Sultān Shihab ud din is not mentioned by either Firishtah or Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India

⁴ I have translated the text as it is in the MSS and in the lith ed but I am very doubtful about its correctness I cannot understand the reference to the twenty one thrones and also to the rising of Mahmud Shah from the east of the throne of the empire As regards the rising of Mahmud Shah from the east the reading from Firishtah is a great improvement It is و افاد دولب و افاد دولب I probably the correct reading of the Tabaqat was something like this As to the twenty one thrones I cannot hazard any explanation

throne of the empire. The ¹*amīns* and the great men of the city and the notabilities of the kingdom stood in their proper places. Each one of them received such distinction as was suitable for his position, and some of the *amīns* were honoured with titles and seven hundred elephants which were ²in the environs of the fort came into use.

After a few days a report came from Jāwash Khān, to the effect, that as the star of the good fortune of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn had fallen into the abyss of ruin, he did not listen to all the friendly advice and the wise precepts which were given to him, and came forward to give battle. And this helpless one (*i.e.* he himself) advanced to chastise him placing the great good fortune of His Majesty in the vanguard, and at the first onset Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn's foot of firmness slipped from its place, and he fled. The bearer of his umbrella was slain, and the umbrella fell into our hands. He himself fled to the country of ³Asī. As the rainy season had now come, Sultān Mahmūd Shāh summoned Jāwash Khān back. The latter returned to the fort on the last day of Rabī'-ul-awwal, and received many favours.

Sultān Mahmūd, now having his mind at rest in respect of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, entrusted the management of the affairs of the kingdom to ⁴Basant Rāy, to whom the post of the *vazīrat* of Nāsir Shāh had belonged. Basant Rāy, ⁵owing to his great pride and ignorance,

¹ I have adopted the reading in the MS. That in the lith. ed. is امر و ارکال و اکابر و معارف ممالک

² The MSS. have در دور فلعه but the lith. ed. has در فلعه. I have adopted the former. The meaning of در آمد is not at all clear. The corresponding passage in Firishtah is more intelligible. It is و عتق آمد و بحیر فیل که در فلعه و عتق آمد و بحیر فیل که در فلعه و عتق آمد و بحیر فیل که در فلعه and seven hundred elephants which were in the fort were brought to the *darbār*, adorned with housings of velvet and gold tissue.

³ The Tabaqat has ولایت اسیر, and Firishtah has بلاد اسیر. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, however, says, he retired to the fortress of Asir.

⁴ The name is written in various places in the MSS., and in the lith. ed. as well as in the lith. ed. of Firishtah as نِسْبَت رَای Nisbat Rāy, but in other places as رَای Basant Rāy. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 246) has Buswunt Row and the Cambridge History of India (p. 365) has Basant Rāi.

⁵ The nature of Basant Rāy's offence is not quite clear. Of course he was a Hindū, and the other *amīns* were Musalmāns, but Basant had apparently

did not maintain the usual relations towards ¹ the army and did not leave out any minutiae of meanness and mischief making and having adopted a harshness of behaviour did not show proper respect towards the *amirs* and *sardars*. The latter having availed themselves of an opportunity killed him in the audience hall on the 7th Rabi ul *thani*. ² Naqd ul mulk who was of the same religion as Basant Ray and the latter's colleague in service fled into the harem of the Sultān Iqbal Khan and ³ Mukhtas Khan talked together and said Unless the kingdom is purified of the contamination of the existence of this impure one he will always be in ambush for taking revenge for Basant Ray. They sent the following message to the Sultān by Sadr Khan and Afdal Khan. Nothing has been done and nothing will be done by these loyal slaves except in the way of a sincere desire for Your Majesty's well being and it must be clear to your illuminating wisdom that as the affairs (of the kingdom) have not been well arranged the act of leaving the threads of the administration in the grasp of people who are strangers to us in creed and religion is (likely to be) the cause of disorder in the conduct of government. It has probably been submitted to Your Majesty by some of your well wishers what kind of treatment Basant Ray meted out to the *amirs* and to your other loyal adherents. His sole object was that your old servants might become heart broken and they and their retainers might be

been the minister of Nasir Shah also. The *Tabaqat* says he did not show the usual courtesy towards the army and left out no minutiae of *دفاعی کباب* according to the MSS and according to lith ed of *نکات دفعه* appears to mean little ness or meanness, *کباب* economy or thrift and *نکات* means mischief making. I have adopted *نکات* in the translation. Firishtah says the other *amirs* became hostile to him lest he become too powerful (*منادا بفر و سلط بهم رساند*). Col Briggs says he was a personal favourite of the King and had attended him from the period of his birth and he also says that the conspirators declared that he had laid a scheme to overturn the government. The Cambridge History of India page 365 is satisfied with saying that the Muslim nobles resented his holding the high office of minister.

¹ One MS has quite incorrectly *حائب ساء* instead of *حائب ساء*.

² Firishtah lith ed also calls him Naqd ul mulk but Col Briggs (vol IV p 246) has Nizam ool Moolk. He is not mentioned in the Cambridge History of India.

³ It is *محضرمال* instead of Mukhtas Khan in the text edition.

dispersed This was in fact disloyalty on his part, and we your loyal servants, in a body, removed him out of the way Naqd-ul-mulk is also following in his footsteps If it be your noble order, the world might be purified of the contamination of his existence ' Sultān Mahmūd in his weakness and helplessness sent Naqd-ul-mulk to the *amīns*, but he ordered that he might be exterminated, and no injury caused to his life or property When they brought Naqd-ul-mulk, ¹ the *amīns*, acting in a body, expelled him Sultān Mahmūd was aggrieved at these proceedings of the *amīns*, and at their domination, and the purity of his heart was changed to resentment

Muhāfiz Khān, eunuch, the combination of whose disposition was made up of malice and wickedness, ² owing to his longing for the *vazārat*, reported (to the Sultān), in private, words that were not true ³ in respect of the *amīns* It so happened, that one day availing himself of an opportunity, he represented to the Sultān, that Iqbāl Khān and ⁴ Mukhtas Khān wanted to raise one of the (other) sons of Nāsir Shāh on the throne Sultān Mahmūd, simply on hearing this news, became anxious, and wanted to punish the two ministers But afterwards acting with patience and calmness, he set about making enquiries and investigations

When Muhāfiz Khān saw, that his words had not produced any result, he grew more insistent in his calumnies, and every day made use of harsh words, till one day Sultān Mahmūd ordered some people,

¹ Firishtah says that to this extent they tried to please the Sultān

² Firishtah lith ed is not explicit about Muhāfiz Khān's motive, and neither Col Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India says what his motive was Firishtah and Col Briggs say nothing about Muhāfiz Khān's intrigues against Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān, but they say that he quarrelled with the Sultān and used unmannerly language towards him After some fighting the Sultān had to leave Shādīābād, and Muhāfiz Khān then brought Sāhib Khān out of the fort, and raised him to the throne According to the *Tabaqāt* this happened sometime afterwards, i e, after the rebellion of Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān and the death of Sultān Shihāb ud-dīn, and the submission of a petition by Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān The Cambridge History of India mentions the intrigues of Muhāfiz Khān and the rebellion of Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khan, etc (p 365)

³ The reading in the MSS and in the lith ed is *ارامراء* but I think the meaning is about or in respect of the *amīns*

⁴ *محمود خان* in the second MS

that they should slay Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan when they come according to custom to make their salute

And when things came to such a pass one of the eunuchs who was on special terms with Mukhtas Khan reported to him what was happening. Mukhtas Khan immediately went and informed Iqbal Khan and an hour had not yet elapsed when a man came to summon Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan.¹ Mukhtas Khan hastened without any delay to wait on the Sultan and Iqbal Khan remained occupied with the affairs of state. Mukhtas Khan seeing that things were not as on previous occasions² returned and came to Iqbal Khan and they went away to their respective houses. Muhafiz Khan then reported to the Sultan that Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan had gone away to their houses so that they might collect their retainers and raise one of the Shahzadas to the³ *saltanat*. He suggested that it would be advisable to go there and seize them⁴ and not defer what should be done today to tomorrow.

Couplet

Time⁵ takes off from the man

Who to tomorrow delays today's work.

Sultan Mahmud believed the words of that⁶ deceitful traitor and advanced towards the houses of Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan. The latter fled with a hundred horsemen and foot soldiers and came out of the fort on the side of⁷ Qudipur on the night of the 24th Rabi ul thani. They rode all night and in the morning reached the village of⁸ Sarabahi near the Narbada river. From that place

¹ On MS by mistake omits the whole sentence from من حال من الله
معه ل نود

One of the MSS has برامده instead of برگسته

² One of the MSS has by mistake بطلب instead of طلب

³ One MS omits the words from کار امور to سوارند

⁴ The word in the MS and in the lith. ed. appears to be نورا which may be derived from نورا to break off

⁵ One MS omits the word مکار

⁶ One MS and the lith. ed. have فاسی نور but the other MS has عارینور

⁷ Firsihtah and Col Briggs do not name the village. They narrate the facts of the rebellion of Mukhtas Khan (whom they call Maliku Khan) and Iqbal Khan after the narrative of the rebellion of Muhafiz Khan and the raising

they sent Naṣrat Khān, son of Iqbāl Khān, on the 25th of the month in the direction of the country of Asir, to bring Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. Early the next morning, Sultān Mahmūd sat on the *masnad* of rule in the audience place, and conferring the title of Khawājah Jahān on Muhāfiz Khān entrusted the office of the *vazārat* to him. He then conferred the titles of *Maqlis-i-Karīm* on Afdal Khān, and of Dastūr Khān on Jāwash Khān, and sent them to put down Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān.

When Naṣrat Khān, after traversing various stages, arrived in the presence of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, the latter in his great joy and happiness, started on the following day from the country styled "the Mumtāz", which is a name for the territory of Bijāgarh and Kharkūn, and in his great eagerness he traversed thirty *larōhs* in one day and night. It so happened, however, that the heat was so great, that fish were scorched in the depth of the sea, and fiery natured salamanders were drowned in their own sweat, and Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn fell ill and his condition became abnormal, and on the 3rd of Jamādī-ul-āwwal he accepted the summons of God.

Couplet

There is the way of non-existence, which none who exists,
Will e'er the danger of traversing escape

And some say that he was poisoned at the instigation of Sultān Mahmūd. Naṣrat Khān, dressed in blue (mourning) garments, and taking the corpse with him came to Sarābah, where the Khāns were assembled. When he arrived there, Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān, in great sorrow and distress, sent the dead body to the fort of Shādī-

of Sāhib Khān to the throne by the latter. According to Firishtah lith ed Iqbāl Khān and Makhsūs Khān went themselves to Asir, and held the umbrella over the head of Shihāb-ud-dīn, and after his death they raised the umbrella over the head of his son, and gave him the title of Sultān Hūshang. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 250) agrees generally with the lith ed of Firishtah, but he says, contrary to the other historians, that it was Medny Ray, who had acquired an undue influence over the Sooltan, who persuaded the latter that Yekbal and Mukhsos Khan "were carrying on a treasonable correspondence with the King of the Deccan", and at his instigation the Sooltan ordered the former to be put to death. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, also does not mention it, though it says that they fled to the Narbada. M Hidayat Hosain has سرایه Sarāiyah in the text-edition.

ābid They gave the title of Hushang Shah to ¹ the adopted son of Sultān Shihab ud dīn and held the umbrella over his head and raising the dust of disturbance started from that country towards the centre of the country of Mālwa

Couplet

Jamī¹ it is better that at this stage you adopt the view
That from the deaths of others you fear your own

After the arrival of the dead body the Sultān wept much and deposited it in the earth He carried out the customary rites of mourning and gave alms to deserving people After finishing them he sent Nizam Khan to reinforce Dastur Khan Nizam Khan traversed the stages on wings of speed and joined him Then joining their forces they attacked Hushang and the latter fled and took shelter in ² the hills of Bihar Bībī Hajī

While these things were happening petitions came from Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan to the effect that Nothing has ever been done by these ancient hereditary slaves except rendering loyal service to your Majesty and Muhafiz Khan owing to his envy and ill will having spoken interested and malicious words has turned your noble heart against your old servants They hope that the truth about the disloyalty and ⁴ wickedness of Muhafiz Khan and of his acts will be revealed to your just mind They also believe that some of your other loyal servants will in their disinterestedness attest in private

¹ Both MSS have منبى adopted son but the lith ed has سر son
The Cambridge History of India page 36 also has son

² The meaning and appropriateness of the couplet are not very clear Also the first word is either حامى which is the name of the celebrated Persian Sufi poet who was a native of Jam or حای a place I think Jamī is better

³ Firishtah lith ed has ' نکهت گری fled to the hills He goes on to say that after some time Iqbal Khan and Mukhtas Khan joined the service of Sultān Mahmud and were received with favour Somewhat contrary to this Col Briggs (vol IV p 200) says that after some slight opposition the prince and his minister (apparently Yekbal Khan) threw them elves on the King's mercy On the other hand the *Cambridge History of India* page 365 says that Hushang took refuge in Sehore but the leaders convinced the king that they were loyal at heart

⁴ The phrase is حرام حواری حرامطور in the MSS and حرام رادگی in the lith ed In the text edition it is نادر حواری و حرام حواری

to the truth of these words ' When the purport of these petitions became known to Sultān Mahmūd, some of the Sultān's servants said that, "The object of Muhāfiz Khān in making the insinuations was, that he should be able to act independently in carrying out the affairs of the state, and the turn of the *varānat* would not come to him, if Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān were there. In fact, his whole energy had been devoted to this, that he might place a new face on the affairs, and having brought one of the sons of Nāṣir Shāh out of prison, he should assign the name of the Sultān to him, and should himself be the loosener and fastener (sole dictator) of all affairs "

Sultān Mahmūd, who had no caution and foresight in his acts, ordered that when Muhāfiz Khān comes to make his salute, he should be seized, and kept under guard, and should, after investigation, be punished. When the adherents of Muhāfiz Khān informed him of the truth of what had happened, he appeared in the precincts of the audience hall, with his retainers, on the following day, which was the 18th Jamādī-ul-āwwal. After a little while Sultān Mahmūd summoned him to his private chamber. He went there, and gave harsh replies to his words. Sultān Mahmūd, in great anger and bravely, marched out with few followers from among his servants and a body of Abyssinians, and that wicked man fled out of the palace, and taking possession of the outer building raised the standard of revolt. He brought Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, son of Sultān Nāṣir-ud-dīn, and besieged Mahmūd Shāh in his palace. He was about to seize the latter, when he came out in the middle of the night, and started towards the town of Ujjain. From that place he summoned Dastūr Khān and the other *amīns* to his presence, after giving them assurances of his favour. That very night when Sultān Mahmūd started in his flight, Muhāfiz Khān bestowed the title of ¹ Sultān Mahmūd on Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, and placed him on the throne. After some days, Dastūr Khān arrived in Ujjain, and after him, Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl

¹ The MSS as well as the lith ed say, that he received the title of Sultān Mahmūd. It shows a lack of imagination in Muhāfiz Khān that he could not give him any other title. It must have been very confusing to have the same name for both the Sultāns. Firsihtah and Col Briggs do not appear to mention the title which was given to Sāhib Khān. In fact he is always called Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān in the histories. The Cambridge History of India, page 365, says that Sāhib Khān was proclaimed king under the title of Mahmūd II.

Khan joined the Sultan Shahzāda Sahib Khan on hearing this news summoned Sadr Khan and Afdal Khan and he¹ had engagements and promises with them confirmed by very strong oaths

On the 5th of Jamādī ul awwal he left the fort of Shadrabad in charge of Mawadab Khan and marching to the town of Nalcha made it his camp and with the concurrence of Sadr Khan ordered that a third part of the wages of the soldiers should be paid to them in cash from the treasury to enable them to make the necessary preparations for the march to Ujjain Sultan Mahmud marched from Ujjain to Dibalpur and after a watch of the night the commanders who had their families in Mandu mounted their horses and started for the camp of Shahzada Sahib Khan The next day Sultan Mahmud marched from Dibalpur in the direction of Chanderi and writing an account of what had happened sent it to Bihjat Khan The latter wrote in reply This slave is bound to obey him who should have the capital city of Shadrabad in his possession Sultan Mahmud on receiving this reply became amazed and anxious about his future He halted in the village of Behishtpur and held a consultation Some of his adherents said We should take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhor The opinion of others was that they should ask for help from Sultan Sikandar Lodi Sultan Mahmud declared It appears in my mind that we should wrap up our feet in the skirt of patience and should wait for the rising of the stars of good fortune it appears that it is right to take shelter in the fort of Ranthambhor for a time as it is imaginable that we should have help and support It appears improper however on my side to ask for help from my equals And cutting off the chain of hope from all created things he waited for the appearance of what was in the womb of fate

After a few days Medini Ray who was distinguished by great bravery and experience came from his *thana* and joined him Bihjat

¹ The readings are slightly different One MS has عهد و پیمان را اعلم This appears to be the best reading The other MSS have عهد و پیمان را بنمای اعلاط موکد گردانند This does not appear to be correct The lithed has عهد instead of عهد and omits the را after بنمای in the reading in the first MS

The name is موب حان in one MS and مودب حان in the other and مودب حان in the lithed M Hidayat Ho ain has حان دردن in the text edition

Khān becoming aware of the impropriety of his (previous) acts, sent ¹ Sharzah Khān, his son, to attend on the Sultān, and the latter, feeling that he was now more powerful, determined to march to Mandū. After some time news came that Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān was advancing towards Chandēri. When he encamped in the village ² Shahrāi, the parties thought it advisable that they should arrange their troops the next morning, and await the blowing of the wind of victory and triumph. It so happened, that after the passing of one watch of the night, ³ Afdal Khān mounted his horse, and came to Sultān Mahmūd's camp, and a little more than half the army, acting in concert with him, also joined Sultān Mahmūd's camp. Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān and Muhāfiz Khān, in great terror and confusion, set fire to their camp, and fled. On the 4th day they arrived in Naṣratābād, and opened the hand of lavishness for squandering the treasures, and occupied themselves with guarding and arranging the fort.

Sultān Mahmūd performed the rites of offering thanks to God, and advanced towards Shādīābād. When he arrived in the village of ⁴ Sirsiah, the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn and his *amīns*, who had fortified themselves in the foot-hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī,

¹ The name is Sharzah Khān in both MSS. Col Briggs calls him Shirza Khan, governor of Chandēri. The lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt* has Siddat Khān and the Cambridge History of India, page 366, has Shiddat Khān.

² The name of the village is شہرائی and سہرائی in the MSS. and سہرائی in the lith. ed. The name does not appear in *Firishtah* or in Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India, though they all mention the battle which took place there. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted سہرائی in the text edition.

³ Neither *Firishtah* nor Col Briggs mentions the defection of Afdal Khān from Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān's camp. The Cambridge History of India, page 366, mentions it, but its account differs in some particular from that in the text. In the first place, it says that the armies met in the evening. This is correct, if it means that the armies came near each other in the evening, but it certainly is not correct if it means that the armies engaged each other in the evening. Then it says, that Afzal Khān deserted, "taking half of the army with him." This is very indefinite, as it does not say half of what army he took with him. The *Tabaqāt* is quite definite, and I presume it is correct that he took all his own army and half of Malik's army.

⁴ The village is called سرسیہ Sirsiah in both MSS., and سرسہ Sirsah in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned in either *Firishtah* or in Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India.

came to Sultan Mahmūd and obtained a promise of safety. Then by successive marches Sultan Mahmud encamped in the town of Sirsiah and on the next day which was the 17th of Ramadan in the year 917 A.H. he advanced to Shadābad the seat of the throne with his army in battle array. On both sides the ranks were arrayed and the field of slaughter was arranged. Shahzādā Ṣahib Khan acting with bravery attacked Sultan Mahmud's army. At this time an elephant advanced towards Sultan Mahmud and he shot an arrow aiming at the breast of the *filban* with such force that it came out of the latter's back. At this time Medini Rāy with a body of his Pajputs utterly routed Ṣahib Khan's army wounding the latter with their lances and *jamdhars* (a kind of dagger). The Shahzādā being unable to withstand them fled and some of his men took shelter in the fort and a number concealed themselves in the caverns which are to be found in the neighbourhood of Māndu. Sultan Mahmud pursued them as far as the *Haud-i-Khas* (special reservoir) and encamped there.

The Shahzādā occupied himself with the defence and other arrangements of the fort and endeavoured day and night to secure it against attack. Sultan Mahmud owing to his natural kindness sent the following message to him. As the relation of brotherhood is between us and the observance of the relation of kinship is one of our duties natural morality induces me that I should bestow on you whatever place you may ask for and you may take away as much property as you can carry away and may go away without any objection from me. So that for no reason whatever the blood of

¹ The Cambridge History of India page 366 gives November 98th (1519?) as the date of the battle.

One MS. has *فراولں حملہ آورد* but the word *فراولں* does not occur in the other MS. or in the lith. ed.

² There is some difference in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have *و گروهی در عارهای که در حوالی مددو رابع اسب محضی سدد* with the difference that the MS. has by mistake *ار حوالی* in stead of *در حوالی*. The other MS. has *و در کوهها و عارهای نه در حوالی مددو رابع اسب محضی سدد*. The reading in the lith. ed. appears to me to be the most correct and I have accepted it. In the text edition it is *و گروهی در عارهای که در حوالی مددو رابع اسب - محضی*.

Musalmāns may not be spilled ” Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, being proud of the strength of the fort, did not agree Sultān Mahmūd then seized the environs of the fort, and made great efforts in carrying on the siege, till on the 16th Shawwāl of the afore-mentioned year (the troops) by the exertions and endeavours of Maulānā ‘Imād-ud-dīn Khurāsānī and other brave soldiers entered the fort about the beginning of true dawn, and attacking the men in a bastion fought hand to hand with them, and in the twinkling of an eye mingled the blood of the followers and adherents of the Shāhzāda with the dust of wretchedness The Shāhzāda and Muhāfiz Khān taking with them a quantity of precious gems, fled by the path of the seven hundred steps, and on the 4th day joined the camp of Sultān Muzaffar in ¹ the town of Barōda, one of the dependencies of Gujrāt Sultān Muzaffar considering, the arrival of the Shāhzāda an honour, did not leave out a single minutia in the rites of hospitality He promised that at the end of the rainy season he would take possession of the country of Mālwa, and divide it among the brothers

From that place they went to Chāmpānū ² One day the Shāhzāda happened to go to the house of Yādgār Muḡhul, who was celebrated as *Surkh Kulāh* (the red cap), and had come to Gujrāt, as an ambassador from Shāh Isma‘il Safvī There were high words among their servants, which ended in a scuffle A report spread among the common people, that Yādgār Surkh Kulāh and his men had taken the Shāhzāda of Mandū as prisoner Men belonging to the army of Gujrāt, coming in crowds, killed some of the retainers of Surkh Kulāh The Shāhzāda, from shame and ignominy, turned his face towards the kingdom of Asir, without taking leave of the Sultān He with three hundred horsemen encamped at the village of ³ Lōigāon, which is distinguished as the boundary of Asir Lōdhā the governor of the

¹ Both the MSS have در قصه بروده گجرات, but the lith ed has در قصه بروده ار دواج گجرات I have adopted the latter reading M Hidayat Hosain has در قصه بروده گجرات in the text edition

² One MS omits the word (وری) and also the word بر before منزل

³ The name of the village is written as لورگانو, probably Lōrgāon, in the MS, and as ناوگانو Naugāon in the lith ed It is not mentioned in either Firishtah or in Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India In the text edition it is نورگانو

town of Kandūyah having received information of this came with great quickness and attacked him Sahib Khan fleeing from him sought shelter with the ruler of Kawil which is in the Deccan. As affectionate relations existed between Sultan Mahmud and the ruler of Kawil the latter kept himself back from helping the Shahzādā but allotted a few villages as a contribution towards his expenses.

After that as disturbances disappeared from the kingdom and disorder was changed into order Sultan Mahmud took his place on the dais of peace and tranquillity. Governors and *thanadars* and revenue officers went to the different divisions and districts for the organisation of the kingdom. Medini Ray wanted to become all powerful and to remove the *amirs* of Chiyath Shah and Nasir Shah out of the way and in pursuance of this wicked purpose he began to speak ill of the *amirs* and in private he slandered everyone till one day he submitted (to the Sultan) that Afdal Khan and Iqbal Khan had sent ¹ letters to Shahzādā Sahib Khan and wanted to re-awaken the disturbances which had been put to sleep. Sultan Mahmud imagining these interested words to be disinterested ordered that when Afdal Khan and Iqbal Khan should come to make their *salams* they should be slain. On the following day when they in accordance with the usual custom came to make their *salams* both of them were seized and torn joint from joint.

Sikandar Khan the governor of Satwas and Fath Jan Khan Sherwani seeing this audacity and violence of Medini Ray fled and went to their *jagirs*. Sikandar Khan rebelled and took possession

¹ The word is written as مكاتب مكاتب in the MSS and مكاتب in the lith ed. This last appears to me to be the best and I have retained it. In the text edition it is مكاتب

² The name is written as سواس Sawas and اواس Awās and اسواس Aswas and سواس Satwas in different places in the MSS and the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed mentions Sikandar Khan and his rebellion but does not as far as I can make out mention the name of his *jagir*. Col Briggs in one place (vol IV p 201) calls him Skundur Khan of Bhilsa but this is apparently a mistake for it was Mansur Khan who was sent against him and not Sikandar Khan who was a *jagirdar* of Bhilsa. The Cambridge History of India page 366 calls Sikandar Khan governor of Satwas. M Hidayat Ho am has adopted سواس in the text edition.

of ¹ the country from Kandūyah to Shahahābād, and drove out the revenue officers of the *Khālṣa*. Sultān Mahmūd came down from the fort of Mandū, in order to put down this rebellion, on the 5th of the month of Jamādi-ul-ākhir of the year 918 A.H., and took up his residence in the *Jahān-numā* palace at Na'icha. He entrusted the office of the *vazīrat* to Mēdinī Rāy. He sent men to Bihjat Khān, governor of Chandēri, and other *amirs*, and summoned them. Bihjat Khān in spite of the relationship of *Khānazādī* (being a slave by descent), fearing (what Mēdinī Rāy might do to him), wrote an excuse about the near approach of the rainy season. Sultān Mahmūd affected to overlook this, and wrote to Mansūr Khān, the feudatory of Bhilsā to advance and put down Sikandar Khān. Mansūr Khān collected his troops and advanced to attack Sikandar Khān, but when he arrived in the neighbourhood of the latter's country, his spies brought him the news, that Sikandar Khān had collected an immense army, and had also got the Rāys of Gōndwāna to join him. Mansūr Khān halted there, reported the facts to Sultān Mahmūd, and asked for reinforcements. Mēdinī Rāy wrote in reply, that if he was guilty of procrastination and delay in seizing Sikandar Khān, he would become liable to suffer from the chastisement of the Sultān's wrath. Mansūr Khān on receiving this ² order, became amazed and anxious about his future, and returned and joined Bihjat Khān. ³ Sanjāi Khān who had been nominated to reinforce Mansūr Khān also went and joined the latter.

Sultān Mahmūd on hearing these news started from the capital, came to Dhār, and performed the pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Kamāl-ud-dīn Mālwi. He then sent Mēdinī Rāy with a large army and fifty elephants, from the town of Dībālpūr, to put down Sikandar Khān, and himself went to Ujjain. Mēdinī Rāy, on arriving at

¹ Firishtah lith. ed. describes the country as *ارکندوه تا قصه شهاباد* but he does not say that Sikandar Khān took possession of it. He says that he had possession of it, *در تصرف داشت*. Col Briggs on the contrary says, "He occupied the country lying between Kuhndwa and Shahabad", and about the last named place says in a footnote "probably Shahpoor". The Cambridge History of India does not mention what territory Sikandar Khān seized.

² The word is *بحکم* in one MS. and in the lith. ed., and *حکم* in the other MS.

³ In text edition it is *تجار خان* Tujjār Khān instead of *سبحار خان*.

Satwas stretched his hand for plunder and devastation and the unalloyed pleasure of Sikandar Khan having thus become disturbed he in his helplessness sought the path of peace and through the intervention of Habib Khan came to Medina Pāy. The latter went to Ujjain and obtained the pardon of Sikandar Khan's offences. Sultan Mahmud drew the pen of pardon across his offences and allotted (confirmed) his rank and *jagir*. Sultan Mahmud then marched from Ujjain and came to the town of ¹ Āgar. There a petition or report came from the *darogha* (superintendent) of the fort of Shadiabad to the effect that a body of low people had risen in revolt on the night of the 25th Ramadan and had raised the umbrella which they ² had brought from the tomb of Sultan Ghiyath ud din over the head of a man of obscure descent and had stretched their hands to plunder the city but that by the good fortune of His Majesty he (the *darogha*) had seized the head and ringleader of the mob and the men had been punished. The Sultan sent an order containing expressions of favour and encouragement to the *darogha* and himself went towards ³ Bahar Baba Haji.

From that place he sent a letter giving encouragement and promising favour to the Bihjat Khan by the hand of Bherodas but as his all seeing eye was besmirched with the dust of misfortune he sent an improper reply and sent men to Kaul that they might bring Shahzada Sahib Khan making him their leader. He also submitted a petition to Sultan Sikandar Lūdi to the purport that Mahmud Shah had entrusted the bridle of loosening and fastening and of defending and regulating the kingdom to the hands of *Kafirs* and had placed his foot of submission outside the path of the ⁴ Muṣṭafa (the chosen one Muhammad) to whom be the salutation and has

¹ See page 570 and note 1 on the same page. The Cambridge History of India which does not mention the town at the place referred to on page 225 mentions it here (p. 367) and calls it Āgar.

² One MS has *اورده* and the other *برداسته* after *ار بر سلطان عباد الد*. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. I have inserted *اورده*. In the text edition it is *برداسته*.

³ See page 581.

⁴ One MS has by mistake *مصطوبه* instead of *مصطفوية* and also has *وسلم* instead of *السلام*. The lith. ed. has *والسلام* after *السلام*.

made the followers of Islām wretched and miserable, and the *Kāfirs* and Rājputs dear and honoured. ¹ If a detachment of his victorious army should arrive in these parts, the public prayers would be read in the name of that *Bādshāh* who is the asylum of the faith, and ² his coin would be current in the country. When Bherīdās came and reported all this, Sultān Mahmūd collected troops, and after one week marched from ³ Bahār and encamped in the village of Shikāipūr. On the following day, he sent Mukhtas Khān with a large army to Chandēri in advance of himself.

⁴ About this time news came that about the middle of Muharram-ul-harām in the year 919 A.H. Sultān Muzaffar Gujārī had encamped in the town of Dhāt, with a large army and five hundred elephants, and was occupying himself with hunting in the environs of the village of Dilāwarah. Although ⁵ Rāy Pithōrā and the other *amīrs*, who were in the fort of Mandū, sent a message to him, in their distress and weakness, by some trustworthy men to the effect that at this time, when Sultān Mahmūd was engaged in attending to the administration of his kingdom, his (i.e., Sultān Muzaffar's) intention of invading it appeared to be altogether remote from the rules of bravery and humanity. He did not at all listen to it with any idea of good will and acceptance, and sent Nizām-ul-mulk Sultānī with a large army to the neighbourhood of Na'leha. The latter arrived at the *Haud-i-Rānī*

¹ The facts of Bihjat Khān's sending for Shāh-rūda Sāhib Khān and also asking Sultān Sikandar Lūdī to send an army, and promising that the public prayers would be read in his name appear to be rather inconsistent, but Firishtah explains that if Sultān Sikandar Lūdī would help to place Šāhib Khān on the throne, the *Khutba* would be read in his name as the suzerain or overlord.

² There are slight differences in the readings. One MS. has وسکه ایسان و ایسانرا ساحت و ساحت حواهد شد, and the other has the same except that the words وسکه ایسانرا ساحت instead of وسکه ایسان شد while the lith. ed. has وسکه ایسانرا شایع سارد. I have adopted the first reading. In the text edition the reading is the same except that ایسان را is used in place of ایسان, and ساحت instead of شد.

³ I suppose this means Bahārī Bābā Hājī.

⁴ The inroad of Sultan Muzaffar is only incidentally and briefly mentioned by Firishtah and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India (p. 367) also mentions it, and adds that "Muzaffar was recalled to Gujarāt by domestic disturbances."

⁵ Son of Mēdinī Rāy.

(the Rani's reservoir or tank) but returned from there. At the time of his return a ¹ body of men came down from the fort and attacked him. Nizam ul mulk turned round and slew some of the men and the others sought shelter in the fort. Sultan Mahmud on receiving this terrible news became distressed in mind and anxious and amazed and did not know in what direction he should attempt first. Suddenly while he was extremely distressed news arrived that Sultan Muza'fir Gujrati had turned back and had gone back to Gujrat by way of Dahud. Sultan Mahmud having performed the rites of offering thanks to God placed the destruction of Bihjat Khan in the forefront of his energy.

After some days news came that Sikandar Khan had again raised the standard of rebellion and a flag of violence and had taken forcible possession of some villages belonging to the *Ahalsa* (i.e. lands in direct possession of the Sultan). Sultan Mahmud deputed the governor of the town of ³ Kanduyah named Malik Lodha to punish him. ⁴ Malik Lōdha advanced towards ⁵ Satwas. After the two sides had met the dust of disturbance and warfare continued from morning till evening. In the end Sikandar Khan being unable to withstand him

¹ One MS. has *حمعی* and the other *مردم*. The lith. ed. has neither or any similar word.

² *دعور* in the text edition.

³ About Kanduyah see page 558 and note 6 on the same page. Firishtah has at this place *حاکم کندوی و ملک بودہ*. Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 54) calls him Mullik Lado the governor of Kuhndwa. In another place Firishtah lith. ed. calls *کند و غیر کندونہ*. The Cambridge History of India page 367 does not give the name of the governor but calls him a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience.

⁴ The Cambridge History of India page 367 describes the incident in a single sentence which owing to the necessity of too much compression or from error conveys ideas which are totally different from the facts as narrated in the *Tabaqat* and by Firishtah. The sentence (a part of which I have already quoted in the preceding note) is Sikandar Khan had defeated and slain a loyal officer who had endeavoured to reduce him to obedience. Malik Lodha was neither defeated nor slain by Sikandar Khan. On the other hand he defeated Sikandar Khan and he was assassinated by a man probably a soldier in Sikandar Khan's army who had a private grudge against him.

⁵ *سواس* in the text edition here but *سواس* earlier on see note 2 page 587.

turned his face in flight. Malīk Lōdhā's troops pursued him, and were engaged in plundering. At this time, ¹ a man whose family had been taken prisoner, came up to Malīk Lōdhā, on the pretext of kissing his feet, and stabbing him in the side with a poisoned dagger destroyed the capital of his life. Sikandar Khān on hearing this ² returned, and drove Malīk Lōdhā's men before him, and took six elephants and many horses as booty, and returned triumphant and victorious to Satwās. When this news came to Sultān Mahmūd, he considered the destruction of Bihjat Khān of primary importance, and advanced towards Chandēri. On the way news was brought to him, that about the middle of Dhīl-hijjā-ul-harām, Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān had arrived at Chandēri from Gōndwāna, and Bihjat Khān and Mansūr Khān had gone forward to meet him, and had proclaimed him as the Sultān. Sultān Mahmūd halted at the village of ³ Sājanpūr, and occupied himself with collecting troops.

After some days news came that ⁴ Sa'id Khān Lūdī and 'Imād-ul-mulk had encamped at a distance of five *karōhs* from Chandēri with the army of Dehlī from the side of Sultān Sikandar to reinforce Sāhib Khān. Sultān Mahmūd on hearing this news became extremely disheartened, and thought it advisable to ⁵ return to his own place (*i.e.*, I suppose Mandū). On the way, he summoned the *amīrs* to his presence, and got them to strengthen their promises and engagements by oaths. But in spite of their oaths and the renewal of their engagements, when a part of the night had passed, Sadr Khān and ⁶ Mukhtas Khān, who were ⁷ truthful *amīrs*, fled towards Chandēri. Mahmūd Shāh sent a body of men in pursuit, and himself encamped

¹ Firīshṭah describes him as یکی از لشکریان سکندر خان که عیال و سرشده بود *i.e.*, one of Sikandar Khān's soldiers whose family had been made prisoner.

² One MS omits by mistake the words from مردم ملک لودھا to دستوراست برگشت.

³ The name is Sājanpūr and Sājan in the MSS, and Sījanpūr in the lith. ed. It is not mentioned by Firīshṭah or Col. Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. The latter says in the corresponding passage that Mahmūd "retired to Bhilsa and remained for some time in that neighbourhood."

⁴ One MS omits Khān after Sa'id.

⁵ One MS has by mistake معاودت instead of مقاومت.

⁶ One MS has دیگران instead of محتمس خان, Mukhtas Khān.

⁷ The epithet truthful is probably used ironically.

in the town of ¹ Sironj On the 1st of Safar he passed through the inhabited part of the town of Bhilsa and encamped on the bank of the neighbouring river When his army went past the gate of the town the agent of Mansur Khan in concert with a body of the low or common people of the town plundered those who had fallen behind On hearing this news the spirit of the bravery and self assertion of Sultan Mahmud came into motion and he gave an order so that in a moment his men seized the citadel and slew that body of men of evil destiny The citizens were plundered owing to the wickedness of those men and their wives and children became subject to the misery of slavery

The Sultan having halted in those parts for some days for hunting ³ Shahzada Sahib Khan and Bihjat Khan considering this delay to be a very great boon sent Malik Mahmūd with a large army towards Sarangpur Jhujar Khan the agent of the feudatory of Sarangpūr fought with and defeated him Malik Mahmud fled and did not rest till he had arrived at Chandern and Jhujar Khan seized much booty and returned to Sarangpūr At the time when the detachment under Malik Mahmud returned fleeing Sa'id Khan Ludi and Imad ul mulk sent this message to Bihjat Khan The promise had been given that when the ⁴ victorious Sikandari troops should arrive in the ⁵ territory of Chandern the public prayers would be read in the great name of the Sikandar of the age (i.e. Sultan Sikandar Ludi) and the *Dirahams*

¹ The place is so called in the MSS and also in the lith ed It is not mentioned by Frishtah or Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India

One MS has by mistake *سوح* instead of *سومب*

³ The Cambridge History of India page 367 omits the events between the proclamation of Shahzada Sahib Khan as Sultan and the sending of the force by the rebels to Sarangpur It mentions the latter event but does not give the name of the commander of the force or that of the agent of the governor of the place who defeated him Frishtah lith ed also mentions the incident and he gives the name of the commander of the fort as *محمود نام* i.e. a man of the name of Mahmud but does not give the name of the agent of the governor who defeated him Col Briggs (vol IV pp 254 255) calls the commander of the force one Mahmood Khan but says he was alarmed at the approach of the King's army and fled disgracefully

⁴ One MS has *منصور* but the other and the lith ed have *منصوره*

⁵ One MS omits *حندری*

and *Dīnārs* would be struck and ¹imprinted with the name of that sovereign, but up to the present day no sign of these things has shown itself ” As they ²did not get a reply such as they wanted, they marched from the village of Shahrīāī, and halted at a place fourteen *karōhs* further back From that place they sent a report of what had happened Sultān Sikandar sent a *farmān* recalling them When Sultān Sikandar’s army, annoyed at what had happened, went towards Delhī, Sultān Mahmūd being expectant of receiving the grace of God, planned a hunting excursion At this time, one day in the course of the hunting a spy submitted a report, that Khwājah Jahān and Muhāfiz Khān had marched away towards Shādīābād with a large army Sultān Mahmūd returned from the place where he received the report, and deputed Habib Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk and ³Hēmkanan to put down and crush Muhāfiz Khān Habib Khān and the other *amīns* arrived at Na’lcha on the 16th Rabi‘-ul-thānī It so happened that Muhāfiz Khān had arrived there three or four hours before them, and a battle having taken place, he, owing to the ill luck which always follows a rebel, was killed, and his head having been cut off, they returned with victory and triumph to their own camp Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān, on hearing this news was full of grief and sorrow, and shut the door of the entrance and exit of the Khāns before his face

Bihjat Khān and Sadr Khān thought it advisable, that with the intervention of the learned men and Shaikhs, they should ask for the pardon of their own offences, and should pray for one out of the

¹ One MS and the lith ed have ملوک instead of مسکوک, which is the correct word

² One MS has by mistake نه نوشتند instead of نداشتند Firishtah explains that public prayers were read in Sultān Sikandar’s name in Chandērī, but as about forty thousand Rājput s had assembled in Sultān Mahmūd’s army, Sultān Sikandar recalled the force which he had sent and which, according to Firishtah, consisted of twelve thousand horsemen

³ The name is written with slight variation in the MSS and in the lith ed, but looks like Hamikanan Firishtah lith ed gives the name of Habib Khān and Fakhr-ul-mulk, and adds many of the Rājput *amīns* Hamikanan or Hēmkanan was apparently one of them Col Briggs mentions the name of “Hubeeb Khan” alone The Cambridge History of India, page 367, says briefly “an attempt of Muhāfiz Khān to return to Māndū was defeated ”
نکرن in the text edition

many districts of the kingdom for Shahzada (Sahib Khan) They then went together to Sahib Khan and submitted these proposals to him. He said: This has been recurring to my mind for a long time. I have been sorrowful and unhappy at the coming of Sultan Mahmud's army but praise be to God! that this danger has passed away. Bihjat Khan then with the advice of the *amirs* sent Shaikh Auliya to the Sultan's camp and prayed for the pardon of their offences and asked for a place to help in the expenses of the Shahzada.¹ Sultan Mahmud considering this to be one of the supernatural mercies and indubitable blessings made over the fort of Raisin and the villages of Bhilsa and Dhamoni to the Shahzada and gave him for his immediate expenses - ten *lakhs* of *tanlas* and also twelve elephants and sent *farmans* promising favour to Bihjat Khan and² the other *amirs* and *khans*. He then gave permission to the emissaries of Bihjat Khan to return and sent a body of his own servants with them. When Shaikh Auliya and the other emissaries arrived in the neighbourhood of Chanderi Bihjat Khan sent his son Sharzah Khan to welcome them and met them on their arrival with honour and respect. When he learned the purport of the *farmans* he sent the *farman* for the government of Raisin and Bhilsa to Sahib Khan by the hand of Sharzah Khan but kept the ten *lakhs* of *tanlas* in cash and the twelve elephants with himself. Some strife mongers said to Shahzada Sahib Khan that Bihjat Khan had determined that on the morning of the *Id i fitr* (the *Id* of the breaking of the fast) he would seize him and some of his immediate adherents in the *Alima-gah* and³ he had accordingly sent Shaikh

¹ One MS omits Mahmud after Sultan.

Firishtah lith ed has ننگه سنا and Col Briggs has copper tangas. The Cambridge History of India page 367 has a substantial amount without further definition.

² There are slight variations in the readings. The reading I have adopted is that in the lith ed. One MS omits امرا and the other has حواس و امرا.

³ The meaning is not clear. On the whole it appears that Bihjat Khan did all this but why he should have strengthened the engagement with Shaikh Auliya or should have sent for some troops is not very clear if he was arranging matters secretly to secure Sahib Khan on the day of the *Id*. Firishtah does not make matters clearer as he says that Sahib Khan betook himself to Sulṭ in Skandar Ludi immediately on hearing that Bihjat Khan wanted to make him a prisoner. Col Briggs does not refer to the matter at all. The Cambridge History of India page 367 says that The retention of the money by Bihjat

Aūhiyā to the camp, and had strengthened the promises and engagements with oaths, and had sent for a body of troops. On hearing this news, a great fear and terror came on the Shāhzāda, and he spent all day in thought and anxiety, and on the night of the 9th Ramadān, he without thinking of his ultimate fate chose to tread an unknown path, and betook himself to Sultān Sikandar's army, which was on the frontier (of Mālwa). When this news reached Mahmūd Shāh, he on the 19th Shawwāl came to Chandērī. ¹ Bihjat Khān and the great men of the city hastened to welcome him, and made their excuses. Mahmūd Shāh drew the line of pardon across the page of their offences and distinguished each one of them by conferring robes of honour and by giving rewards. He stayed there for some days, and having arranged the affairs of that neighbourhood went back to the capital city of Shādiābād.

Then at the wicked instigation and by the evil counsel of Mēdmī Rāy he struck the merciless sword at the *amīrs* and *sardārs*, and making each of them suspected and accused of offences not committed by them brought them into the place of punishment. Gradually things came to such a pass, that the disposition of Mahmūd Shāh turned from all the *amīrs*, and in fact from all Musalmāns. He placed the mark of dismissal on the forehead of the old officers who had formed a faithful band, and had been entrusted for years, under the government of Ghiyāth Shāh and Nāsir Shāh, with all matters of revenue, and appointed the helpers and confederates of Mēdmī Rāy in their places. Owing to these acts, most of the *amīrs*, *sardārs* and public servants became broken hearted, and holding the hands of their relatives and families chose to exile themselves from their country. The fort of Shādiābād, which had at one time been the home of learning and contained men of wisdom, and Shaikhhs, became the residence of ² *Kāfirs*. Things finally assumed such a shape, that all offices and

Khān excited the apprehensions of Muhammad, who believed that he was about to be betrayed to his brother."

¹ I suppose that the Sultan and they all considered that the flight of Shāhib Khān had offered them a very easy way out of many difficulties.

² The word is written as کواران in the MSS and کوران in the lith ed. I cannot find any meaning of کوا or کور that would suit the context. The nearest meaning of کوا is a class of gipsies in India, and of کور the blind. In

ports in the government of Mahmud Shah even down to those of a *darban* (door keeper) or *filban* (elephant keeper) were given by Medini Ray to his own agents. There did not remain in the service of Sultān Mahmūd more than two hundred men belonging to the class of Musalmans. And ¹even Musalman and Saiyid women ²were taken by the Rajputs and were turned into slave girls. They were taught the art of dancing and were made to join the *akhharas* (dancing clubs). They even took possession of the singing women of Sultan Nasir ud din.

Sultan Mahmud although he saw the power and violence of the Rajputs was powerless. And as the custom among the people of Hindustan is that when they send away one of their servants or bid adieu to a guest they give him *pan* (beetle leaf) Sultān Mahmud sent a vessel filled with *pan* made into packages for chewing to Medini Ray by the hand of Āraish Khan and gave him a message that after that he had permission to leave (the Sultan's service) and he should go out of his (the Sultan's) kingdom. The Rajputs replied:

We forty thousand horsemen have up to this day performed loyal and devoted service and have never committed any fault. We have done praiseworthy service. We do not know what fault has been committed by us. When Āraish Khan took this reply the Rajputs assembled in the house of Medini Ray and determined that they should remove the Sultan and place Ray Rāyan the son of Medini Ray on the throne. Medini Ray said: At the present moment the

the corresponding passage in Firishtah the word is کافران which is all right and I have taken it. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted گواران or gipsies in the text edition.

¹ Firishtah lith. ed. says that Ali Khan one of the old *amirs* who was the governor of the city was exasperated by the domination and violence of the Rajputs and he assisted by the people of the city took possession of the fort when Sultan Mahmud had gone on a hunting excursion attended by his Rajput servants. When they returned they besieged the fort and Ali Khan had to evacuate it. He was pursued and was seized and executed. This is mentioned also in Col Briggs (vol IV p. 256) but he changes the name of Ali Khan to Ghalib Khan. The Cambridge History of India does not mention these incidents.

One MS. has سدد in place of سدة and then leaving out the following words as far as سلطان مسعود ابن امروا ددة substitutes for them اسبلاي راجپوتان بي ظاوب سد

saltanat of Mālwa is in reality in our possession If, however, Mahmūd Shāh does not remain as a buffer, Sultān Muzaffar Gūjrātī will come galloping along and will seize the kingdom Therefore we should, in every way that may be possible, endeavour to please our master ”

Then Mēdinī Rāy with other Rājput̃s waited on the Sultān, and standing in the place of those who prayed for pardon submitted, “It is not ¹ concealed from your world-adorning wisdom, that from us (who are your) slaves, nothing ² but loyalty and service has been shown By the grace of God we slew with great torment Muhāfiz Khān, who was a great enemy of the Sultān Although man is steeped from head to foot with sins and offences, still no offence has been committed by us, which might throw dust over, and cause pain to Your Majesty’s gracious mind, and even supposing that owing to human frailty a harsh deed should have been perpetuated by us, we hope that, with your innate generosity and natural inclination to forgive, you will grant us pardon for it, and after this, nothing will be done by us that would be contrary to your wishes and pleasure ” Sultān Mahmūd whether willingly or otherwise acted with politeness, and abandoned the idea of a conflict on this ³ condition, that he would make over all the posts in the different offices, according to previous custom, to the old Musalmān officers, that Mēdinī Rāy would not give his men any right of interfering in the affairs of state, and they should send out Musalmān women from their houses, and should shorten the arm of oppression Mēdinī Rāy owing to the exigencies of the time accepted the conditions, and tried hard to please the Sultān But ⁴ Sālbāhan, who was the *vazīr*, refused to obey, and refused to give up his wicked acts and evil practices

¹ One MS has معتنى while the other and the lith ed have معلى

² Both MSS have بعد, but the lith ed has بغير

³ The same conditions are mentioned by Firishtah, lith ed, but the word مالی is inserted after ملكى in it Col Briggs mentions them also with some variations The Cambridge History of India (p 368) mentions only one condition, viz, that about the keeping of Muslim women by Rājput̃s as concubines, which it describes as the greatest offence in the eyes of the Muslims

⁴ The correct transliteration of the name as in the text is Sālbāhan, but the correct translation of the Sanskrit name is Sālibāhana Col Briggs transliterates the name as Salb’han, but in a note has Salivahan The Cambridge History of India, page 368, has Sālibāhan In the text edition it reads

Sultān Mahmud with great bravery in spite of the fact that he had not more than two hundred Musalmans in his service determined in consultation with some of his special adherents that when he should¹ return from hunting and Medini Ray and Salbahan should receive permission to go to their houses they (i.e. those adherents) should at the time of their returning cut them to pieces. The next day he went out hunting leaving the men who had been chosen for the work at their places. Returning from the hunting he went into his private chamber and gave permission to Medini Ray and Salbahan to go home. At this time those men came out of ambush and wounded Medini Ray and Salbahan. The last named was killed on the spot but as Medini Ray's wounds were not fatal he was carried to his house. The Rajputs on hearing this news prepared themselves and collected in Medini Ray's house with the object of causing an injury to Sultān Mahmud. The latter on hearing this with very great bravery and courage came out of the palace with only 16 Musalman horsemen and a few foot soldiers in order so to say to suffer martyrdom and prepared to fight. Some thousands of Rajputs came forward and commenced an attack. One of the *Purabiya* Rājputs who was noted for his bravery placed his foot firmly on the battlefield and threw a weapon at the Sultān. The latter carried it and cut the assailant asunder. Another Rajput threw his javelin at the Sultān. The latter caught it on his sword and cut him into two from his

اما سالاهن نورده سرار ابعاد سجده
 ۱۲۱۱

and there is no mention of who was the

¹ Firmin and Col Briggs agree generally with the text as to the attack on Medini Ray and Salbahan the subsequent attack by the Rajputs on the palace and the Sultān's great bravery in repelling it. It appears however that the first attack on the palace was made without consulting or asking the permission of Medini Ray. They also say that although the Sultān was deficient in intelligence he had no equal in bravery and also that when the Rajputs asked for Medini Ray's permission to make a second attack (Col Briggs says they asked him to head it) he told them to desist from it. The Cambridge History of India page 368 says that the Rajputs were defeated chiefly owing to their fear of provoking the intervention of Muzaffar II of Gujarat. This is certainly not correct. The Rajputs were defeated in a fair fight although the odds were very much in their favour. They were however forbidden by Medini Ray from making a second attack for fear chiefly of provoking the intervention of Sultān Muzaffar of Gujarat which is very different

waist The Rājput̃s on seeing this fled, and collected together, and wanted to advance in a great crowd to slay the Sultān

When Mēdinī Rāy became acquainted with this resolution, he said, "Mahmūd Shāh is my benefactor, if his men wounded me by his order, what business is it of yours? If the shadow of his greatness be not over our head, Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī would completely destroy us" The Rājput̃s went back to their houses at the word of Mēdinī Rāy, and the tumult subsided That night Mēdinī Rāy sent a humble message to the Sultān saying, "As during the whole of my life I have never done anything but wish for your welfare, and act faithfully to my salt, I have carried my life in safety from the wounds If in reality, the affairs of the kingdom can be better regulated by my being put to death, I have no objection even to that" Mahmūd Shāh said, "I have arrived at the conclusion, that Mēdinī Rāy is a loyal servant of mine Owing to his great devotion to me, he kept the infuriated Rājput̃s back yesterday from creating disorder and disturbance I shall heal his wounded heart with the ointment of favour and graciousness"

After some days, when ¹ Mēdinī Rāy's wounds had healed, he came with five hundred armed horsemen to make his *salām*, and thenceforward he came every day in the same way to make his *salām* Mahmūd Shāh, on account of his great courage and bravery, treated him in the same way as before, and reassuring him sent him to the office, so that he might attend to the affairs of state When a considerable time elapsed with the Sultān acting with gentleness and courtesy, and he saw that there was nothing left to him of rule except the name, he in the months of the year 920 A H, came out of the fort of Mandū on the pretext of going out hunting He took with him ² Rānī Kaniyā, who was the most beloved of his harem, ³ and the large body

¹ There are variations in the readings One MS has *رحم او مدممل گرد* the other has *میدی رایی* in place of *او* The lith ed has a different reading *رحم او مدممل گردید* In the text edition it is *تدبیل بص - کرد*

² The name is written in the MSS as *رانی کنا* and *رانی کهارا* in the lith ed See, however, note 2, page 302, from which it appears that she was called Rānī Kanākrā in the *Mirāt-i-Sikandarī*

³ The sentence is left incomplete in the MSS, as well as in the lith ed In the corresponding passage, *Firishtah* has *نه بهانه شکار را، و تا برا تردد در بار فرموده*

of Rajputs who used always to accompany him as his guard and always went about surrounding him. The Sultān said in private to the superintendent of the stables who was an old servant of his: I shall go out hunting tomorrow and I shall make the Rajputs run so much in pursuit of the game that when they would arrive in the camp they would have no sense or power of movement left. When midnight should have passed you should make ¹ three very swift horses ready outside the camp and should inform me. On the following day he went out hunting and when the evening came and the Rajputs went to sleep owing to much fatigue the superintendent of the stables in accordance with the orders brought out three specially selected horses and informed him. Mahmud Shah relying on the Divine aid and help went up to the horses and all three of them turned to the open country which was quite unknown to them. - After traversing many stages and passing many places when they arrived in the town of Dahud which was on the boundary line of Gujrat Qaisar Khan the *thanadar* of Sultān Muzaffar Gujrati carried out the customs of welcoming him and performed the rites of hospitality. He presented pavilions and all necessary articles and wrote a report to Sultan Muzaffar and made him acquainted with the fact of Sultān Mahmud's arrival. When the news reached Sultān Muzaffar at Champanir he carried out the customs of offering thanks to God and he sent Qaisar Khan and Taj Khan and Qawam ul mulk and other great *amirs* to welcome Sultan Mahmud. He also sent Iraqi horses and some elephants and articles of the *toshakkhana* (ward robe) red curtains articles of *farashkhana* and other equipages which are required by Sultāns. He himself advanced some stages to welcome the guests. Afterwards when the conjunction of the ² two beneficent planets and the meeting

مودة و ~ ه كرده بود on the pretext of hunting he had given much work to the Rajputs and had made them tired and exhausted. The same idea is conveyed in the following sentences of the *Tabaqat*

¹ One MS has سراسب but the other MS and the lith ed omit the word سر

For another account of the flight of Sultan Mahmud and of his reception by Sultan Muzaffar and the subsequent events see the section about Gujrat page 30^o onwards

² Jupiter مسمو and Venus زهرة e here the two Sultans

of the two luminaries took place in one *maylis* and on one throne, Sultān Muzaffar observing the customs of generosity and the rites of liberality made wise inquiries and presenting royal gifts placed (soothing) ointment on his wounded (spirit)

After some days, ¹ Sultān Muzaffar advanced into the country of Mālwa with a well-equipped army, and when he arrived near Dhār, Rāy Pithōrā strengthened the fort of Mandū, and busied himself with measures of guarding it. Mēdinī Rāy and Silhadī went to Chitōr with some thousands of Rājputs, and sought the protection of Rānā Sānkā. Sultān Muzaffar besieged the fort of Mandū, and distributed the batteries. After some days Rāy Pithōrā approached him with humility, and after asking for safety prayed for fourteen *paiganas* for his own *jāgīr*. Sultān Muzaffar in his great kindness granted his prayer. On the following day Pithōrā again sent a message saying, "As we have committed many evil deeds, and fear and alarm have come upon us, if you would retire with your army for a distance of three *karōhs*, we would take hold of the hands of our wives and children, come down from the fort, and surrender it to anyone whom you may order." Sultān Muzaffar accepted the prayer of that deceitful band, and took up a position three *karōhs* behind his former station. Then it became clear, that Rāy Pithōrā was merely wasting time, and waiting for the arrival of ² Mēdinī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā.

The Sultān then, acting with hostility and violence, returned (to his former camp), and surrounded the fort like the centre of a circle. At this time news was brought that Mēdinī Rāy and Silhadī had given large sums to Rānā Sānkā, and promising him more were bringing him with all the *zamīndārs* of the neighbourhood to aid and reinforce them, and they had arrived near the city of Ujjain. Sultan Muzaffar sent Ā'zam Humāyūn 'Ādil Khān, the ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, who was his nephew (sister's son) and son-in-law, and Fath Khān and Qawām-ul-mulk to chastise and punish Mēdinī Rāy.

¹ Nizām-ud dīn does not say what Mēdinī Rāy did to meet Sultān Muzaffar, Firishtah and Col Briggs do so in some detail. For another account of the siege and capture of Mandū as given in the history of the reign of Sultān Muzaffar in the section of the Tabaqāt about Gujrāt, see pages 303, 304.

² In the text edition it is رانا سانکا و مددی رایی instead of Mēdinī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā.

and Rana Sankar and devoted his energy to the capture of Mandu fort. It so happened that a man came and represented: "The hill (on which) the fort is built can be climbed by an easy path and Ray Pithora has got only a small number of men there. As tomorrow is the day of the *Holi* festival the Rajputs will be occupied in their houses with play and amusement. If on that day you return to your camp after fighting at the other batteries and after that send a detachment by that path and keep another detachment ready to help and reinforce it it is possible that the fort would come into your possession."

Sultan Muzaffar liked his advice and strengthened him with promises of favour and reward. On the 13th Safar in the year 924 A.H. 1529 A.D. the soldiers of the Gujrat army commenced to fight from the different directions and made many brave assaults. The Rajputs also exerted themselves almost beyond their power. The Gujrat army beat the drum of retiring just before the afternoon and returned to their batteries. The Rajput *sardars* as they had made very great exertions and as it was the day of the *Holi* left a few men in the bastions and rested in their houses. When half the night had passed Taj Khan and Imad ul mulk with a body of great warriors commenced to climb the hill along the agreed path with that guide in front of them. Taj Khan also ascended it by another path. Imad ul mulk on arriving near the rampart found that the Rajputs were asleep and had no knowledge of the coming of the enemy. Immediately his men made a ladder of "farangi" lances which enabled a body of them to climb to the top of the rampart. When these men saw that the sleep of death had overpowered the Rajputs they very silently put their feet on the ground and opened the gate. When the gate was being opened the Rajputs came to the place. The warriors who were outside the gate made an onset and got inside the fort and cut some of the Rajputs into pieces and those who escaped the sword fled.

¹ Firishtah does not give the date but simply says in the beginning of the year 94 A.H. The date is not given in the section of the Cambridge History of India about Malwa but is given as February 23rd 1518 the day of the Hindu festival of the *Holi* in the section about Gujarat (p. 319).

Both the MSS have "ار سره های فرنگی" i.e. of French or European lances. I have not been able to find out what the special lances or spears were like.

When this news reached Rāy Pithōrā, he sent Shādi Khān *Pūrabīya* with five hundred Rājputs, in advance of himself, to put down 'Imād-ul-mulk. He himself followed Shādi Khān with some thousands of Rājputs. The Gujāt warriors coming within bow-shot pierced the men who were coming along in front of Shādi Khān with their arrows, and they on receiving those life-scorching wounds fled like wounded pigs. About this time Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī entered the fort by the same route. When the eyes of the garrison fell on Sultān Muzaffar's standard, they returned to their houses and performed *jauhar*. (This is) a practice of the Rājputs, that in times of discomfiture and distress, they set fire to their houses, and put their wives and children to death, and burn themselves. They call this practice *jauhar*. Hosts and crowds of Gujātī warriors entered the houses and residences and committed a general massacre. It has been correctly ascertained, that during that night and a part of the following day nineteen thousand Rājputs were slain, and so much booty and so many prisoners fell into the hands of the army of Gujrāt, that the ¹accountant of the age confessed his weakness and failure in computing them.

When with the strength of Divine help, the victory was attained,* and the Rājputs, who had been unfaithful to their salt, had received their reward, Sultān Mahmūd came, and offering his congratulations, asked quickly, "What does the lord of the world order me?" Sultān Muzaffar, in his ²greatness said, "May the rule of Mālwa be of good omen to you." He left Sultān Mahmūd in the fort of Shādīābad, and returned immediately to his camp. On the following day he raised the standard of departure from that station towards Ujjain with the object of punishing Rānā Sānkā. When he arrived at the fort of Dhār, they brought him the news, that 'Ādil Khān and the *amīns* had not yet gone beyond the town of Dibālpūr Banhariya, when Rānā Sānkā, on hearing the capture of the fort, had fled and gone to his own country, and had traversed a distance of twenty-seven *karōhs*, taking Mēdinī Rāy and Silhadī with him. Sultān Muzaffar, on hearing this news, carried out the practice of praising, and offering

¹ A figurative way of saying that the booty and prisoners were beyond computation. One MS has by mistake *دور* instead of *دورگار*.

² One MS has by mistake *ندگی* instead of *برگی*.

thanks to God and summoned Ādil Ḳhan and the *amirs* Sultān Mahmud waited on Sultān Muẓaffar at this station and submitted

If your Majesty would go to the fort of Shadiabad and would exalt me by remaining there for one day

Couplet

On that side your greatness would suffer no less

On this side it would give me nobility great

Sultān Muẓaffar left his camp at Dhar and went himself to the fort of Shadiabad Sultān Mahmud carried out all the duties of hospitality and offered suitable tribute After the *maḡlis* and the entertainments were over Sultān Muẓaffar went over the buildings and the gardens and then went back to his camp From there accompanied by victory and triumph he started on his journey to Gujrat

Sultān Mahmud on account of his great affection and devotion ¹ attended on him for some stages Sultān Muẓaffar then bade him farewell and left Āṣaf Ḳhan Gujratī with some thousand horsemen to help and reinforce him and asked to be excused Sultān Mahmud taking up his abode in the fort of Shadiabad in concert with Āṣaf Ḳhan sent letters of encouragement and favour to the *amirs sardars* and his own soldiers and summoned them The *amirs* and his own servants came to Mandu from the various places where they resided with happy and joyful steps and when his army assembled round him he with the advice and concurrence of Āṣaf Ḳhan advanced to attack ³ Hemkaran who had fortified himself in the fort of Ĳakrun on behalf of Muḍini Ray On becoming aware of

¹ The words in one MS are برسم منافع همراة رجب In the other MS a word which looks like مصاعة written in place of منافع the word is clearly مصانع in the lith eds of the Ṭabaqat and of Firishtah مصانع means willing wishing desiring I consider منافع the best reading and have adopted it In the text edition مصاعة has been adopted

² The words are عذر حواسب in the MSS and بدر حواسب in the lith ed There are no corresponding words in the lith ed of Firishtah I do not know what reason there was for Sultān Muẓaffar for asking to be excused I suppose it was a mere matter of courtesy

³ He was called Bhīm karan in the Gujrat section of the Ṭabaqat vide page 307 and note 1 on the same page M Hidayat Hosain has بھکر in the text edition

this Mēdmī Rāy said to Rānā Sānkā, "All that I have, is in the fort of Kākiūn I came to you, praying for your help, with the object that you would deliver over the country of Mālwa to me, after thoroughly purifying it But now things have come to this ¹ pass, that they are taking away from me whatever I have " The ² daring and boorishness of Rānā Sānkā having come into motion, he came out of the fort of Chitōr with some thousands of blood-thirsty Rājputs, and advanced towards Kākiūn When this news reached Sultān Mahmūd he owing to his great courage and bravery, abandoned the path of prudence and caution, and raising the siege of Kākrūn, advanced to meet Rānā Sānkā in battle He marched most of the days and it so happened that on the day on which the battle was to take place, he had traversed a very long distance, and had halted at a distance of seven *karōhs* from Rānā Sānkā When this news reached the latter, he sent for his *amīrs*, and said, "It is best that we should attack the enemy at this very moment, for they have come a long way and have no strength to move or exert themselves If we advance fast and quickly, they will have no time to ³ array their troops, and our work would be done with ease " All the Rāys and Rājputs praised and attested to the correctness of this declaration, and they mounted and advanced with their troops in good order

When they arrived near Sultān Mahmūd's camp, ⁴ the troops of the latter came one by one or two by two (*i e*, in very small bands) into the battle, in the way which Rānā Sānkā had predicted, and were immediately made martyrs Because they fought without being properly marshalled, thirty-two *sardārs* among the old and

¹ One MS has کاری رسیده while the other has کار بحای رسیده I have retained the reading in the lith ed which is کار بحای رسید

² The words in the MSS are حمیت و حاملیت The words in the lith ed are حمیت و حمیت is of course incorrect

³ Both MSS have فوج راست کردن I have adopted this, though the فوج اراستن of the lith ed is equally good, if not better

⁴ Firishtah lith ed says, that Āsaf Khān and the other *amīrs* said, that they should not engage the enemy that day, but Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, که ار عقل بی بهره بود, ^{2 e}, who was destitute of intelligence, did not accept their advice

trusted men became martyrs and of the Gujrat army ¹ Āsaf K̲han and five hundred horsemen drank the *sharbat* of martyrdom and a great defeat fell on Sultān Mahmūd's army. The latter however who was extremely brave and courageous stood in the field of chivalry with two or three horsemen and when the Rajput troops advanced against him he galloped on his gray horse which was as swift as the wind and the lightning and dived into the Pajput army which was like a sea of swords and spears. He received a hundred and more wounds on his armour and as he wore two suits of armour fifty of those wounds passed through the inner armour and reached his body. In spite of his having received so many wounds he did not turn his face from the enemy. When he fell off the back of his horse on the ground ² the Rajputs recognised him and carried him to Rana Sanka. Every one of them poured forth their praises and eulogies and offered to sacrifice themselves in his honour. Rana Sanka stood before him with his arms crossed on his breast and carried out the duties of service and attendance and arranged for the treatment of his wounds. When the Sultan regained his health Rana ³ Sanka prayed that he should be exalted by the Sultān by bestowing his crown on him. Sultan Mahmud made over the crown decorated with pearls and other precious stones (*Iauaqt* which means both rubies and sapphires) ⁴ Rana Sanka then sent ten thousand Rajput horsemen with him and sent him to Mandu and himself went back to Chitor.

¹ It may be noted that in the section about Gujrat it was the son of Āsaf K̲han and not Āsaf K̲han himself who was said to have been slain *vide* page 307. In the corresponding passage here Firishtah agrees with the Tabaqat that Āsaf K̲han with five hundred Gujratī horsemen was slain but Col Briggs (vol IV p. 263) says as in the Guzerat section that Āsaf K̲han's son and almost the whole of the Guzeratties were killed.

² Firishtah also says that the Rajputs recognised him but one would have thought that as he had fought with such bravery he would be the cynosure of all eyes and there would be no necessity or difficulty for recognising him.

³ This appears to be a rather extraordinary prayer but Firishtah says that as on the day of the battle all Sultan Mahmud's baggage had fallen into the hands of Rana Sanka and of the Rajputs and they did not find Sultan Hushang's *سراج* among the other articles he asked for it and Sultan Mahmud got it and gave it to him. The Cambridge History of India page 369 says the Rana compelled Mahmud to surrender all his crown jewels.

⁴ Both the MSS and the lith ed say that Sultan Mahmud was sent to Mandu with an escort of ten thousand horsemen but Firishtah lith ed and

¹ It will not remain concealed from the minds of intelligent men, that Rānā Sānkā's act was on a higher level than that of Sultān Muzaffar. The latter gave help to one who had sought shelter with him, but Rānā Sānkā having captured an enemy in battle gave him back his kingdom. No act similar to this wonderful one is known up to the present day. In short, on hearing this news, Sultān Muzaffar sent a large force to reinforce Sultān Mahmūd, and sending an affectionate letter applied ointment to the wounds of his heart, and showed great kindness towards him. The Gujrat troops remained in Mālwa for a long time, but after the rule of Sultān Mahmūd had acquired a certain amount of strength, the latter sent a letter to Sultān Muzaffar, in which he renewed his protestations of gratitude, and prayed that, as his government had assumed a desirable aspect, Sultān Muzaffar should recall his troops. The latter did so, but after the departure of the Gujrat army, Sultān Mahmūd's weakness became evident and patent. He was bereft of nearly the whole of his territory. Rānā Sānkā seized a portion with violence and tyranny, and Silhadi *Pūrabīya* brought the country from the boundary of Sārangpūr as far as Bhilsā and Rāisīn under his control, and became independent. Sikandar Khān was in possession in the neighbourhood of ² Satwās and its dependencies. So that of the kingdom of Mālwa only a tenth part remained in the possession of Sultān Mahmūd, and he remained with

Col Briggs reduce the number of the escort to one thousand horsemen, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 263, footnote) says (without giving any authority for making this statement), that Sultān Mahmūd was conveyed in the first instance to Chittoor, where the place of his confinement is still shown, but he was released on recovery from his wounds. In the same note Col Briggs contrasts the chivalrous conducts of Hindoo princes, "in their behaviour to Mahomedans in general, with the sordid, cruel, and bigotted conduct of the latter" to the Hindoos. This is correct, but I do not know whether the story of Sultān Mahmūd being taken to Chitōr, like the other story of Rānā Kōnbhā's defeating Mahmūd of Gujrat and Mahmūd of Mālwa, and keeping the latter as a prisoner at Chitōr, has any foundation in fact.

¹ Nizām ud-dīn shows himself superior to all communal prejudice by this eulogy on Rānā Sānkā's conduct, but it appears to me that the latter rather marred his proceedings by demanding the surrender of the Mālwa Crown Jewels.

² The name is written سواس and سواس in the MSS, and سواس in the lith ed, but we have already found that the *jāgīr* of Sikandar Khān was Satwās.

twenty thousand horsemen in ¹Jawar Although Rana Sanka possessed the power of taking possession of the entire country of Malwa still having the fear of Sultan Muzaffar before his eyes he restrained himself (*kashidah man bud* which may literally be translated as he kept a tight hold on his bridle)

It so happened that at this time when Sultan Muzaffar passed away and the enemies (of Sultan Mahmud) acquired power and strength the violence of Silhadi extended beyond all measure So in the year 926 A H (1519 A D) Sultan Mahmud having collected an army advanced towards the country of Bhilsa ³Silhadi marched to the neighbourhood of Sarangpur and fought with him Sultan Mahmud's army was routed but he himself stood firmly in the field of bravery with twenty horsemen and coming within bow shot fought with the greatest courage and boldness till some of the renowned warriors in Silhadi's army fell on the dust of destruction at his hands and things came to such a pass that Silhadi escaped by flight Sultan Mahmud pursued him for a part of the way and separating (seizing) twenty four elephants returned to Mandu After that Silhadi came forward in a spirit of submission and friendliness expressed his contritions and sending some beautiful things and presents in the way of a tribute asked for ⁴pardon for his past conduct

And during the year 932 A H 1525 A D Sultan Muzaffar accepted the summons of the just God and the business of the

¹ The name is Jawar in the MSS and *Khawar* in the lith ed I have not found it mentioned anywhere else The Cambridge History of India page 369 says that Mahmud's authority now extended only to the neighbourhood of the capital M Hidayat Hoain has حادر in the text edition

One MS has لسكرى instead of لسكر

³ Firishtah's and Col Briggs's (vol IV p 264) accounts agree generally with the text but they say that Sultan Mahmud rallied the few men who were with him when Silhadi's troops were engaged in plundering and after defeating the latter pursued them to Sarangpur and took possession of it together with twenty four elephants Silhadi made no attempt to recover Sarangpur and remained content with Bhilsa and Raisin

⁴ The word is written as استعفا and استعفى in the MS and استعفا in the lith ed I have retained the reading in the lith ed In the text edition it is استعفاء

government devolved on Sultān Bahādur. ¹ Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muzaffar came to Sultān Mahmūd, and the latter, as he was bound by ties of gratitude to Sultān Muzaffar, showed the greatest respect to Chānd Khān, and left no minutiae of friendliness and generosity unobserved. Radī-ul-mulk, who was one of the trusted *amīns* of Sultān Muzaffar, fled from Gujrāt, and waited on His Majesty Firdūs Makānī ² Bābar *Bādshāh*, and devoted all his energies to the object, that the rule of Gujrāt might be transferred to Chānd Khān, and in order to carry out this purpose, he came from Āgrā to Mandū, and after consulting with Chānd Khān went back to Āgrā. When this news reached Sultān Bahādur, ³ he sent a letter to Sultān Mahmūd, to the effect that it appeared strange that the ungrateful wretch, considering the affection and devotion, (which he owes to me), should desert me, and going to Chānd Khān should endeavour to create a disturbance. After some time Radī-ul-mulk again went to Mandū and then returned to Āgrā. On this occasion Sultān Bahādur did not send any message at all, but prepared to chastise Sultān Mahmūd.

As it had become clear to everybody that Sultān Mahmūd would get no help or reinforcement from Gujrāt, and did not himself possess such a force that he would be able to meet an enemy with strength and power, Ratan Sēn, son of Rānā Sānkā advanced into Mālwa with great force. It happened also that at this time Sultān Bahādur arrived near the boundary of Mālwa with the object of punishing some of his refractory subjects, and chastising those disturbers of peace. Sultān Mahmūd, in his perplexity and distress, summoned Mu'in Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, from Satwās, and Silhadi to his aid. When they waited on him, he conferred the title of *Masnad 'Ālī* on Mu'in Khān,

¹ The Cambridge History of India, page 369, describes Sultān Mahmūd's conduct as characterised by incomprehensible folly and ingratitude. I cannot agree to the charge of ingratitude. He had reasons to be grateful to Sultān Muzaffar, but he could not refuse to give an asylum to Chānd Khān without being accused of ingratitude. He should however, have accepted Sultān Bahādur's accession, and should not have allowed Radī-ul-mulk to come to Mandū and intrigue against Sultān Bahādur, but by all accounts he was as weak mentally as he was brave in battle.

² One MS. has by mistake Humāyūn Bādshāh.

³ There are various slight differences in the readings, and the meaning is not quite clear, but the reading and the translation I have adopted appear to be correct.

and bestowed on him a red pavilion which is specially reserved for a *Badshah*. He also gave some *parganas* to Silhadi and tried to please him. Mu'in Khān who was really the son of an oil seller but whom Sikandar Khān had adopted as a son fled from Sultān Mahmud and joined Sultān Bahadur in the village of Sanbal and made the complaint of his benefactor ¹ a choice subject of talk in the *majlis*.

When this news reached Sultān Mahmud he sent Darya Khān to wait on Sultān Bahadur with the following message. The rights of nurture of your dynasty are incumbent on me and as the distance between us has become less I wish to appear in your presence and offer my congratulations on your accession. His emissary disclosed by winks and jestures that his master was abashed and ashamed owing to his having given an asylum to Chand Khān and had not the hardihood to come. Sultān Bahadur comforted him and said

I have no sorrow about Chand Khān and will not trouble your master about making him over to me. He started from that place and by successive marches arrived and encamped on the bank of the river Karakhi. After five days Ratan Sen son of Rana Sanka and Silhadi *Purabiya* waited on Sultān Bahadur at this station and both of them made complaints about Sultān Mahmūd. Ratan Sen received permission from the same place and went to Chitor. Sultān Bahadur then marched from there and encamped in the village of ³ Sanbal and waited for the arrival of Sultān Mahmud but as the latter had come to know that repeated complaints had been made about him to Sultān Bahadur he marched from Ujjain towards Satwas on the pretext of chastising the servants of Sikandar Khān.

It so happened that while hunting he one day fell off his horse and his right arm was broken and being now disabled and powerless he returned to the fort of Mandū and commenced making preparation for defending it. Sultān Bahadur then by successive marches advanced towards Mandu. At every station servants of Sultān Mahmud

¹ The actual words are *گرواند اس* *گرواند*

Firishtah lith ed al o has *Karkhi*. Col Briggs (vol IV p 267) has Gurchy and says in a footnote this is certainly a mistake

³ The MSS which have *سنبال* some lines before this have here by mistake *سنبال* in the text edition

separated from the latter and entered his service. In the town of Dhār, Sharzah Khān, who was a great *sardār*, also came and joined him, and when he arrived at the town of Na'icha, he besieged the fort and distributed the batteries, and himself took up his residence in Muhammadpūr. Sultān Mahmūd fortified himself in the fort of Mandū with three thousand men, and every night he went over to inspect all the bastions, and then took his rest in the college of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn. But when he came to know that the men in the fort were hostile to him, and had obtained promises from Sultān Bahādur, he moved from the college and came to his palace. He then arranged things for a festive gathering, and occupied himself with play and pleasure. When his well-wishers spoke to him about this, and inquired whether it was the time for pleasure and enjoyment, he said, "As these are my ¹ last breaths, I wish that they should pass with ² joy and in the fulfilment of desires."

On the 9th of Sha'bān in ³ the year 937 A H (May 25th, 1528), at the time of the true dawn, the standards of state of Bahādur Shāh arose above the horizon of the fort of Mandū. At the same moment Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muzaffar, descended from the fort, and took the path of flight. Sultān Mahmūd armed himself, and with a small body of followers met Sultān Bahādur, but finding that he had not the power to withstand him, and considering that the slaughter of the inmates of his harem should precede his own ⁴ death, ⁵ advanced towards the palace with about a thousand horsemen. His men leaving their horses (outside), entered the palaces, but Sultān Bahādur's troops had (already) surrounded them. Sultān Bahādur sent a message to the

¹ The readings in the MSS appear to be انعاس نارد بن افعالس نارعلتی, and in the lith ed انعاس ناسهیں. None of these appear to be correct. The reading in the lith ed of Firishtah انعاس واسهیں is correct and I have adopted it.

² The MSS and the lith ed all have طرب و سحر. Firishtah lith ed has the more commonplace عیس و سرور.

³ See note 5, page 353, as to the day. The date according to the Christian era is given by Col Briggs (vol IV, p 268) as May 20th, 1526 A D, but March 17th, 1531, is the date in the Cambridge History of India, page 369, of the capture of Mandū by Bahādur Shāh.

⁴ One MS has by mistake مردن instead of مردن.

⁵ One MS has by mistake حود instead of گردید. The other MS has شد.

effect that there was protection and safety for Sultan Mahmud and the inmates of his harem and his *amirs* and no one would interfere with anybody's honour or property. Some of the men who were specially near to Sultan Mahmūd kept him back from killing¹ the members of his family and told him that the *Badshah* of Gujrat although he might be bad to him his badness would be better than the goodness of others. (They also said) that there was a strong belief that when he would go and meet Bahadur Shāh the latter would again entrust the rule of the country to him. While this was going on Sultan Bahadur had entered the palace of Sultan Mahmud and had taken up a position with his *amirs* on the terrace of *La l Mahal* and sent a man to summon Sultan Mahmud. The latter left his *sardars* in the palace and himself came² to Sultan Bahadur with only seven of his *sardars*.

The Sultan (that is Sultan Bahadur) showed him every respect and honour and they embraced each other. After sitting down Sultan Mahmud used³ a little harsh language and after that the two Sultans remained silent till the end of the meeting. But it is narrated that the effects of a change in Sultan Bahadur's disposition made its appearance. The words which were used in that *maḡlis* were these⁴. I have given an assurance of safety to the Mahmud Shāh *amirs*. Let them go and settle down in their residences to

¹ One MS ha *عمال* the other has no corresponding word while the lith ed ha *محل*

One MS leaves out Sultan Mahmud and the lith ed Mahmud

³ One MS has by mistake *فرستاد* instead of *آمد* and then add *al o* by mistake *سلطان محمود بهادر آمد*

⁴ *F rishtah* lith ed ha *سلطان بهادر اندک درستی کرده ساکن شد* but he adds further on

و در بعضی بساحتها بنظر آمد که چون سلطان آمد در تکلم درستی نمود و ساه بهادر ساه کجراتی که در مقام عقوبت حکم حس برمود -

Col Brigg (vol IV p 268) says Bahadur Shah was disposed to treat him kindly and even to restore to him his government but the irritability of Sooltan Mahmood's temper and his pride combined hurried him away so far that he abused Bahadur Shah grossly to his face. The Cambridge History of India is silent about the interval between the two Sultans in both the sections about Gujarat and Malwa

⁵ One MS omits by mistake the words from *دادم رفته*

everyone who is in the harem of the Sultān, I have given assurance of safety' He then ordered the ushers and heralds to drive the people out of the palace, and after a moment, he left Āsaf Khān, with one hundred *silāhdars* (troopers) to guard Sultān Mahmūd, and himself went inside the palace On the next day, which was the 10th Sha'bān, Sultān Bahādur also gave the seven men, who had come with Sultān Mahmūd, assurances of safety, and gave them permission to go away On Friday the 12th Sha'bān, the public prayers were read in the name of Sultān Bahādur from the pulpits of the capital city of Shādīābad On the night of Saturday chains were put on Sultān Mahmūd's feet, and he and his seven sons, the eldest of whom had the title of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, were made over to Āsaf Khān, and Iqbāl Khān so that they might be taken to the fort of Chāmpānīr, and kept there in imprisonment

On the night of the *Shab-i-barāt* (the night consecrated to the memory of forefathers), which was the 14th of ¹ Sha'bān, Rāy Singh, the headman of the ² Māls made a night attack on the camp of Āsaf Khān and Iqbāl Khān, with ³ two thousand Bhīls and Kolis Sultān Mahmūd had at that very moment finished the prayers of the *Laylat-ul-barāt* (same as *Shab-i-barāt*), and placed his head on the pillow, when the noise and tumult commenced When he woke up, he cut the chains on his feet At this time, the guards made a martyr of him, as they were afraid that he might escape, and disturbances ⁴ might again appear in the country

Couplet

What ⁵ a dog's trick it is, of the evil doing sky,
That it makes the tigers the prey of dogs

¹ One MS omits چهاردهم شعبان

² Both MSS have مالها The lith ed has يالها Neither Firishtah nor Col Briggs nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the name The *Māls* is a local name of the hilly country M Hidayat Hosain has مالهند ناد Malhiāhbād in the text edition

³ One MS has ده هزار ten thousand

⁴ The MSS have incorrect readings One has دولت بدید آمد and the other has دولت برد In the text-edition it is دولت بدید آید

⁵ One MS has the correct reading سگ ناری, the other has سگ ناری while the lith ed has تنگ ناری

On the morning following that night Āsaf Khan and Iqbal Khan made preparations for putting him in a shroud and burying him and buried him on the bank of the reservoir of Dahud His seven sons were kept in imprisonment in Champanir

The¹ period of his reign was twenty years and six months and eleven days

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF SULTĀN BAHĀDUR

After the death of Sultan Muzaffar the country of Malwa came into the possession of Sultan Bahadur and most of the *amirs* of Sultan Muzaffar came to him As Silhadi *Purabiya* had entered the service before all the other *amirs sarkars* of Ujjain and Sarangpūr and the fort of Raisin were allotted to him as his *jagir* After the rains the Sultan went to ² see Burhanpur Bhupat the son of Silhadi was with him As signs of turbulence and recusancy became apparent from the circumstances of Silhadi the Sultān at the time of his return sent ⁴ Amin Nasir to bring Silhadi to him and he (Silhadi) passed the time by various tricks of delay till in the town of Dhar he ⁵ was seized by the talons of fate as has been written in the section about Gujrat Sultan Bahadur advanced towards Ujjain in order to chastise

¹ Both MSS omit *نام*

The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS but one of the MSS adds the word Gujrat after Sultan Bahadur The lith ed omits the word *حکومت*

³ One MS omits *سدر*

⁴ He is called *ابن بصر* in both MSS in this place but about the various names by which he was called and the result of his mission to summon Silhadi see page 356 and note 2 on the same page in the section about Gujrat

⁵ The readings are somewhat different and the meaning is not quite clear One MS has *در قصه دھار جنگی صا گرفتار سرد* The other has the same reading but the word *جنگی* is written as *بچنگی* The lith ed has Har instead of Dhar which is of course incorrect but otherwise agrees with the reading in the second MS The corresponding passage in *Firishtah* *بھا ر گرفتار آمدہ* is perhaps somewhat better Silhadi was not killed at this time It cannot therefore be said that he was seized by the talons of destiny or fate He certainly incurred the wrath of Sultan Bahadur but *جنگی* or the battle of wrath has hardly any meaning *جنگی سرد* or talons of wrath is certainly better

Pūrabhiyas Silhadi's son fled from Ujjain, and went to Chitōr.

Bahādur bestowed Ujjain on ¹ Daryā Khān Mandōwālī, advanced to Rāisīn. On the way he left Habīb Khān at Āshta, Mallū Khān, son of Mallū Khān, at Sārangpūr, and went and took the fort of Rāisīn. When the period of the siege was prolonged, and unknown images appeared on the pages of the world, of evil destiny, after he had become a Musalmān performed his ablutions, and met his death. This matter has been narrated in detail in the accounts of Sultān Bahādur in the section about Gujāt. Sultān Bahādur, having entrusted Rāisīn, and the neighbouring districts, to Khān 'Ālam Kālpīwāl, returned to Gujāt. He then left Ikhtiyār in charge of the government of the fort of Mandū, and advanced to Chāmpānīr.

In the year 940 A H, 1533 A D, he collected troops, and advanced to conquer Chitōr. ² After besieging it, he, owing to certain matters, made an amicable settlement, and returned to Ahmadābād. In the year 941 A H, he again collected troops, and besieged Chitōr. On the conquest of Chitōr, he fled, in the neighbourhood of Mandisōr. His Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī Humāyūn *Bādshāh*, and retired to Rāi, as has been narrated in its place.

ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF THE DEPUTIES OF HIS MAJESTY JINNAT ĀSHIĀNĪ, MUHAMMAD HUMĀYŪN BĀDShĀH

When the country of Mālwa, and in fact the country of Gujāt came into the possession of the servants of the powerful Chaghtāi dynasty, His Majesty, after the conquest of Gujāt, left Mirzā Īl and Yādgār Nāsir Mirzā in Gujāt, and himself went to Mandū in the same year. ³ Divine jealousy came into operation. The Mirzās and the *amīns* abandoned Gujāt without any war having taken place, and went towards Āgra. These events have been mentioned in their own place. His Majesty, Jinnat Āshīānī also, for reasons of

¹ *Ḥishtah* calls him Daryā Khān Lūdī, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 270) calls him Khan, having joined the preposition *له* to *در* and omitting *با*.
² One MS leaves out by mistake the words from *و بعد از محاصره* to *و بعد از آنکه*.

The words are *عيرت الهی* Divine jealousy, or probably Divine wrath.

state left Mālwa and went away to Āgra. For the period of one year the country of Mālwa was in the possession of the Chaghtai rulers.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF MALLŪ KHĀN QĀDIR SHĀH

When owing to the death of Sultān Bahadur there was disorder in the country of Gujrat and the country of Mālwa remained without a ruler at about that time His Majesty Jinnat Āshiani turned the bridle of departure from Āgra towards the country of Bangāl. ² Mallu Khān son of Mallu Khān gave himself in concert with the *amirs* of Mālwa the title of Qādir Shah. He brought the country from the town of Bhilsā to the vicinity of the Narbada river into his possession and divided it among the old *amirs*. Bhupat Ray and Pūran Mal the sons of Silhadi came back from the territory of Chitor and took possession of the fort of Raisin and its neighbourhood. The power and grandeur of Qādir Shah increased day by day and the *amindars* of all the surrounding country acknowledged allegiance to him and sent him tribute every year.

And gradually things came to such a pass that ³ Sher Khān Afghan at the time when His Majesty Jinnat Āshiani was engaged in trying to effect his destruction sent a *farman* to him from Bengal

¹ There are slight differences in the headings in the MS. One has *دکر ملو حال* and the other has *دکر قادر شاه*. The heading in the lith ed is *دکر دلاور سلطان بهادر گجراتی ملو قادر شاه* is certainly incorrect.

Firishtah Col Briggs and the Cambridge History of India all generally agree about Mallu Khān's rise to power but Firishtah says *روز اوردہ بعد یک سال* and Col Brigg (vol IV p 271) also says that he retook all the country lying between the Nurbudda and the town of Bhilsa after a struggle of twelve months against the Delhi officers while the Cambridge History of India page 369 says he reduced to obedience other chief holders in Malwa. As regards Bhupat and Pūran Mal Firishtah lith ed says they came out of the fort of Jaipur and took possession of the fort of Raisin and that neighbourhood and they admitted their allegiance to Qādir Shah and sent him tributes. Col Briggs agrees to the latter statement but says they came marching from Chittoor. The Cambridge History of India does not say anything about them.

³ Firishtah lith ed describes him as Sher Shah Afghan Sur but Col Briggs (vol IV p 271) curiously calls him Sher Shah Poorby Afghan King of Bengal.

¹ with his seal affixed to it, to the following purport, "As the Mughals have come into (invaded) the country of Bangāla, ² I pray that following the path of sincerity, you should either yourself advance towards Āgrā, or sending an army create a disturbance in the neighbourhood of that city so that the Mughals might return from this country" Qādir Khān also wrote a reply to the *farmān*, and sent it, after affixing his seal to it. Saif Khān Dēhlavī, who was in his service, and always in an unceremonious way told him the truth without mincing matters, represented, "Shēr Khān has so many retainers, and such splendour, that it is permissible for him to affix his seal on the face (of a *farmān*)" Mallū Qādir Shāh said in reply, "³ How does it matter. The great and holy God has now placed the burden of the defence of this great country in the grasp of my power. If he does not observe the rules of courtesy, it is not necessary that I should show honour to him."

¹ One MS and the lith ed have مهر بردوی کرده while the other MS has مهر بردوی کرده. Firishtah lith ed also has مهر بردوی او کرده which appears to me to be better than either of the other readings.

² The MSS and the lith ed all have ارطریقہ احلاص مستدعی است, and I consider that my translation is correct. Firishtah lith ed has طریقہ احلاص مستدعی است which I would translate as "the path of sincerity demands". In any case the language of the *farmān* does not, in my opinion, quite justify the statements in the Cambridge History of India, page 370, that the language used by Sher Khān was "too peremptory for the occasion". It should be stated however that Firishtah says that Qādir Shāh was angry, but it would appear that this was not on account of the language, but because Shēr Khān had sent a *farmān* and not a letter. According to Firishtah, Qādir Shāh said to his *munshī* "do thou also write a *farmān* and affix the seal to it". It is difficult to say whether the statement in the Cambridge History of India, that Qādir Shāh "returned an insolent reply" is correct. I do not know what the language of the reply was, but Shēr Shāh was angry, that the reply was in the shape of a *farmān*. It appears that Saif Khān Dēhlavī who, was one of Qādir Shāh's courtiers, objected to the latter's sending a *farmān* in reply to Shēr Shāh, but Qādir Shāh thought himself to be in every way Shēr Shāh's equal. It appears also that communications from superiors and masters were sealed on the top or face of the paper. In this case both *farmāns* were sealed on the face of the paper, so that both Shēr Shāh and Qādir Shāh arrogated to themselves a superiority over the other.

³ There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS and the lith ed have این چه دخل دارد. I have accepted this and have translated it in the text. The other MS has این چه لال دارد, i.e., what harm is there in this

When Qadir Shah's *farmān* came under Sher Khan's eyes he removed the impression of the seal from the paper and preserved it in the scabbard of his dagger and said: If the great God so wills I shall ask him the reason of this rudeness in my presence.

The country of Malwa remained in the possession of Qadir Shah till the time when Sher Khan after conquering and acquiring dominion over the country of Hindustan advanced to conquer Malwa and when by successive marches by way of ¹ Kharar he arrived near Sarangpur Saif Khan Dhlavi who was a ² servant and courtier of Qadir Shah said: The safest course is this that as a mighty *Badshah* has come into the country and the strength to withstand him is lacking you should go on the wings of speed and on the steps of eagerness and meet him without giving (previous intimation). Qadir Shah considering this opinion to be right went rapidly from Ujjain to Sarangpur and appeared in Sher Khan's *darbar*. When the chamberlains informed Sher Khan of his arrival he summoned him to his presence and distinguished him with special favours. He dressed him in a robe of honour and asked him where he had taken up his quarters. Qadir Shah ³ said in reply: The abode of his slave is the dust of your threshold. Sher Khan was pleased with this reply and bestowed on him a red pavilion and an audience tent and a special bedstead and sleeping robe and articles for the wardrobe. He halted for one day at Sarangpur and then advanced towards Ujjain. On the way he gave orders to ⁴ Shuja at Khan that he should keep special watch on the dear guest and should give to him from the government (stores) whatever he might require.

¹ The name is Kharar in one MS. and Khirra in the other. It is Kharar in the lith. ed.

Both MSS. omit the و between مصاحب and نوکر but as it is in the lith. ed. I have retained it.

³ Firishtah does not credit Qadir Shah with giving the poetic and polite reply attributed to him by Nizam ud din. According to Firishtah he only said *دلاں حای* or such and such a place. Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 272) says he had a secret conference with Sher Shah which does not appear to be correct.

⁴ One MS. has Shuja Khan instead of Shuja at Khan. The same MS. has by mistake *ارمہبات عمرو حود حیدر دار ناسد*. Sher Shah's language appears to have been ironical.

When he arrived in the district of Ujjain, ¹Shēr Khān gave him as a matter of unconsidered hurry, the *sarkār* of Lakhnautī in exchange for the country of Mālwa. He also ordered that Qādir Shāh should send his family and dependants to Lakhnautī and should himself remain in attendance on him. Mallū Khān brought his family and children to the city of Ujjain, and took up his residence in a garden which was located between the camp and the city. One day he was going from his residence to wait upon Shēr Khān, when he saw, on the way, that a number of Mughals of Gwāliar were engaged in cutting earth with their spades, and working the earth in properly constructing the bastions of the fort which (Shēr Khān's officers) always built round his camp. Mallū Khān considered in his mind, "If I accompany Shēr Khān, he will of course order me to do similar earth work", and he determined on flight, and was engaged in thinking how he should manage it. Shēr Khān, becoming cognizant of this, said to Shujā'at Khān "From some improper acts, which have been committed by Mallū, it has come into my mind, that I should chastise and punish him, but as he came and made his submission to me without being sent for, it was right that I should please him. Now that he has come to this place, do not say anything to him, so that he might go away." Mallū finding an opportunity fled. When Shēr Khān received this news, he sent a detachment in pursuit, and he mounted himself and after going a part of the way stopped, and the *amīns* who had been sent in pursuit, went a part of the way, and then returned. Sikandar Khān Sawāsī lest he should also escape was made over to jailors.

Mallū Khān's rule was for six years.

¹ Firishtah explains, that contrary to the expectation of Qādir Shāh Shēr Shāh, being tempted to keep Mālwa for himself gave him the *sarkār* Lakhnautī. I am not quite sure about the meaning of the expression, which is used by Nizām-ud-dīn also, but I suppose it has the meaning I have given it in the text. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 272) says, Sheer Shah "conferred on him the district of Luknow as a residence". The MSS also have سرکار لکھنؤ in place of سرکار لکھنؤ, and the lith ed also has سرکار لکھنؤ in one place, but Firishtah lith ed has *sarkār* Lakhnautī, and the Cambridge History of India, page 370, has "the government of Bengal". In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has adopted Lucknow.

¹ They say that when Mallu Khan fled Sher Khan said this hemistich and Shaikh Abd ul hai son of Shaukh Jamal who was one of his courtiers said the second hemistich

Couplet

You see how Mallu the tricky slave behaved to me
Did not the Prophet say no good in stupid slave

As this couplet is not destitute of wit it has been inserted here

AN ACCOUNT OF SHUJA KHAN

When the country of Malwa came into the possession of Sher Khan he halted for some days in the town of Ujjain and occupied himself in arranging and regulating the affairs of that Subah ³ He gave the towns of Ujjain and Saranpur to Shuja Khan who is generally known by the name of Sayyid Khan and entrusted the government of the whole country of Malwa to him. He appointed Haji Khan Sultan to Dhar and the neighbouring country ⁴ Natu Khan was appointed to the sarkar of Handiyah and that neighbourhood. He then advanced towards the fort of Rantambhor. After a few days news came that ⁵ Nasu Khan the son of Sikandar Khan brother of Sikandar Khan who was in imprisonment had come forward to attack Natu Khan. Shuja Khan collected his men and advanced

¹ This anecdote and the couplet are also mentioned on page 169 of the second volume of the English translation in the history of Sher Khan's reign.

The heading is differently given. One MS has دگر حکومت سعاع خان. The other MS omits the words حکومت while the lith ed has دگر سعاع خان. In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has دگر سعاع خان or an account of Shuja Khan.

² The Cambridge History of India page 340 says "And retired from Malwa leaving behind him as viceroy Haji Khan and Shuja Khan as governor of Satwas." This statement agrees with that on page 168 of this volume but the statement made in the Tabaqat and by Firishtah at this place is different.

³ بانو خان Banu Khan in the text edition.

⁴ The text is a translation of the reading in the MSS but the lith ed and the lith ed of Firishtah have نصر خان بن سکندر خان محبوس جنگ سعاع خان. This may be the correct version as there is no mention of what Natu Khan did to meet the attack. On the other hand even the lith ed (though not Firishtah) says that Shuja Khan advanced to Satwas and Handiyah which he would not have done if he had been attacked himself.

towards Satwās and Hāndiyah After the two sides had met, Naṣīr Khān entered into a compact with some of his ¹ retainers and courtiers, that they should devote all their energies to seize Shujā' Khān alive, in retaliation for Sikandar Khān, so that the latter might perhaps in this way obtain his release Then after the flames of slaughter and destruction had blazed up, Naṣīr Khān and some of his servants, gradually ² with great patience, brought themselves close to where Shujā' Khān was, and seizing him by his collar, and the hair of his head went back towards their own army In the meantime Mubāiak Khān ³ Sarwānī coming to know of what had happened, betook himself to where Shujā' Khān was, and fighting bravely released him He fought so hard, however, that one of his legs was severed below the knee joint, and he fell off from his horse Naṣīr Khān's soldiers wanted to cut off his head from his body, but Rāja Rām Shāh of ⁴ Gwāliar, who was in the service of Shujā' Khān, in concert with some Rājputs, advanced to help Mubāiak Khān Sarwānī, and carried him off (from the field) ⁵ Naṣīr Khān did all that was required of him in the way of bravely exerting himself, but in the end victory and triumph showed their face to Shujā' Khān Naṣīr Khān fled, and went into the country of Gōndwāna

As Shujā' Khān had ⁶ six wounds on his face and his arms, they lifted him, and carried him victorious and triumphant, ⁷ to his own

¹ Both MSS and the lith ed have *نوکړان مصاحب* without any conjunction between the two words

² The words in the MS and in the lith ed are *تکمل بموده*, the meaning of which is not quite clear

³ The word is *سروانی* in one MS and *سرینی* in the other and in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has *سروانی* In the text-edition M Hidayat Hosam has adopted *سرینی* Sirēnī

⁴ The word is *گوالیار* and *گوالیری* in the MS and *گوالیر* in the lith ed

⁵ One MS omits by mistake the words from *نصر حان* to *روی بموده*

⁶ One MS has by mistake *برای* instead of *روی* Firishtah has five or six wounds

⁷ The readings are somewhat obscure The MSS have *بعثا در آوردند*, which has some meaning but which does not say to what place he was carried The reading in the lith ed is *در ~ سور او بردند*, carried him into his presence, but this also leaves out the name of the person into whose presence he was carried Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *در چاه در انداخته بدایره بردند* This

place They had not yet bound up his wounds when a letter came from Hajī Khan Sultānī to the purport that Mallu Khan had come from Binswalah with a large force to attack him and that a battle was a matter of today or tomorrow Shuja Khan seated himself that very day and in the condition in which he was in a *sulhasan* and advanced to reinforce Hajī Khan and with only the night intervening (i.e. on the following morning) Shuja Khan came up with one hundred and fifty horsemen in the vicinity of ¹ Kūmlī Mawasah He awakened Hajī Khan from his sleep and the same moment without any delay began the battle and defeated Mallu Khan The latter fled in great distress and wretchedness and went away to Gujrat and ² did not again gird up his loins

The power and splendour of Shuja Khan increased day by day and gradually he brought the whole of Malwa into his possession When Sher Khan passed away in the neighbourhood of Kalinjar and the duties of the *saltanat* devolved on Islam Khan The latter although he was still displeased with Shuja Khan but as ⁴ Daulat Khan Ajjāla who was the adopted son of Shuja Khan was a great favourite

would be perfectly clear if we knew what حاکم in this place means or for what word it is printed by mistake He could not very well have been thrown into a pit or a well and then taken to his camp It would be all right if حاکم meant some kind of conveyance or the word was a misprint for some words which meant a conveyance of some kind As it is it makes confusion worse confounded M Hidayat Hosain has ³ بلسکر گاہ to the army camp in the text edition

¹ The name is written with some little variation in the MSS and the lith ed The MSS have کوملی سراسه and کوملی مراسه and the lith ed has کوملی مرادسه The name is not mentioned by Firishtah or by any other historians as far as I know M Hidayat Hosain has کوملی بدواسه in the text edition

Col Briggs (vol IV p 273) says that Ibadur Shah was defeated in a night attack but this does not appear to be correct

² One MS and the lith ed have بابر کمر بست but the other MS has بابر کمر بست which is of course incorrect

⁴ Firishtah calls him Daulat Khan without any suffix He is called Daulat Khan Ajjara in the Cambridge History of India page 370 but on the next page the suffix is printed as Ajyura instead of Ajyara

of ¹Islām Khān, in order to please the son, did not withdraw the appearance of outward favour from the father, and showed him all esteem and regard, and placed the reins of the affairs of the entire country of Mālwa in the grasp of his powerful hand. This state of things continued till one day a man of the name of 'Uthmān Khān in a state of drunkenness came into Shujā' Khān's audience hall, and repeatedly spat on the carpets. When the *fariāsh* (the man who looks after carpets, etc.) forbade him, 'Uthmān jumped up, and struck the *fariāsh* with his fist. There was much noise. The *fariāsh* told Shujā' Khān what had happened. He ordered, "First, he was drunk, second, he came into the audience hall, and third, he struck the *fariāsh* with his fist." He said that both his hands should be cut off. 'Uthmān Khān came to ²Gwāliar, and complained to Islām Khān. After some time, Shujā' Khān came to Gwāliar to attend on Islām Khān. One day 'Uthmān Khān went to wait on Islām Khān, and complained about what he had suffered. Islām Khān was angry with him, and said, "You also are an Afghān, go and have your revenge."

They say, that on hearing this news Shujā' Khān became aggrieved at ³Islām Khān's proceedings, and spoke unseemly words. While these things were happening, one day one of Shujā' Khān's intimate friends came and informed him, that 'Uthmān Khān was sitting in a blacksmith's shop, and was sharpening his knife, and speaking absurd words. Shujā' Khān in his great pride was not restrained by these words, till one day when, riding on his *sukhāsan*, he went to the fort of Gwāliar, to offer his *salāms* to Islām Khān. When he came by the Hatiyāpōl gate, he saw that 'Uthmān Khān was seated in a shop

¹ The name is written Aslīm Khān here in both MSS and Aslam Khān in the lith ed., but as he has been called Islām Khān in previous and succeeding passages, I have kept that spelling.

² This is apparently the Gwāliar in the Punjab hills. Firishtah calls it گوالیار کہ دار الملک سلیم شاہ افعان سور بود.

³ The MSS and the lith ed. all have the name as Salīm Khān here, but I have retained Islām Khān. Firishtah lith ed. says Shujā' Khān became angry and spoke unseemly words about Shūr Shāh. This can scarcely be correct, as he had no grievance against the latter. On the other hand, Col. Briggs (vol IV, p. 274) says that Shooja Khan merely said, "Sulim Shah is a fool for his pains."

¹ wrapped up in an old mantle Shuja Khān wanted to enquire from him about the matter on the way. But Uthman Khān suddenly jumped up from the platform of the shop and wounded Shujā Khān. The *silahdars* or armed retainers who were accompanying the *sukhasan* immediately seized him. They saw that he had an iron hand rudely fashioned which he had firmly fixed in the place of the severed hand and with that badly fashioned hand he had thrown a dart. The *silahdars* killed him on the spot and turning back the *sukhasan* of the ² Khān took him to his residence. The wound was on his left side but as Uthman Khān's hand had no strength it was only skin deep.

When Shuja Khān was wounded and Uthman Khān got his deserts there was a noise and tumult among the men in the camp. Islam Khān on receiving the news sent the great men and the chiefs of the state to make enquiries. He wanted also to come and visit him. But Shuja Khān had understood that his sons and other near relations suspected that (Uthman's) audacity was due to the instigation and encouragement of Islam Khān. He therefore had regard to their ⁴ fearlessness and did not approve of Islam Khān's coming to him and sent the following message. This slave is a slave of ⁵ your

¹ The readings are different here and are all more or less unintelligible. One MS has *و خود را بکدر برهنه بپوشیده*. The lith ed has *سب پپوشیده*. Firsihtah lith ed has in the corresponding passage *خود را بکهنر کهنه پپوشیده* and Col Briggs (vol IV p 274) has *wrapt up in an old mantle*. This latter would be all right if *کهنر* meant a mantle but I cannot find that it has this meaning. However for want of anything better I have adopted it.

Here again the readings are somewhat different. Both MSS and Firsihtah lith ed have *حعلی صربی* while the lith ed has *عملی حربی*. The latter appears to be incorrect but I cannot find any meaning of *حعل* which would suit the context. Col Briggs (vol IV p 247) has *With the blade of a sword*. M Hidayat Hosain has *با دس ناوین حعلی صربی انداخته* i.e. struck a blow with his useless artificial hand in the text edition.

² One MS has Shuja before Khān.

⁴ One MS has by mistake *بی انکه* instead of *بی ناکی*.

⁵ The pronoun *انسان* is in the third person although *سبا* is also used in the same sentence. There are also differences in the readings. One MS has *بده و علام بدر انسان است* while the other MS has *که بده علام بدر انسان است* and the lith ed has *که من بن علام بدر انسان*. Shuja Khān's message

father, and has never excused himself from death or from being slain, he was among the thirty persons who first joined your father and planted the standard of your greatness, as is known to everybody. And even now if he carries his life in safety from this danger, he may be of use to you. This slave does not wish to give you so much trouble that you should come down from the fort and cover all this distance, and indeed these inquiries and favours have been the cause of much distinction to this slave, and have greatly exalted him.

As Shujā' Khān was one of the great pillars of Islām Khān's government and had the rights derived from having performed much service, Islām Khān, in spite of the fact that he had understood from his words what he was saying (or rather, what he meant), waited patiently that day, but on the following day he went to enquire about him. This *faqīr* (the author) has heard from some men, who had relations of friendship with Shujā' Khān, and were ¹ present in that *maḡhs*, that Fath Khān, the uncle-in-law of the sons of Shēi Khān who was so well known for his great strength that no one could seize and twist his hand by intertwinning his fingers with his own, (this is a favourite test in India even now), when he saw Islām Khān enter Shujā' Khān's pavilion alone, wanted to remove him out of the way, and held a consultation in this matter by signs and gestures with Miṡyān Bāyazīd, son of Shujā' Khān, who afterwards assumed the title of Bāz Bahādur, and Miṡyān Bāyazīd also concurred with him in this matter. Shujā' Khān, becoming aware of this, sent Fath Khān away to collect the things required for the tribute (which had to be placed before Islām Khān), and after a moment said farewell to Islām Khān. He told the latter distinctly that after this, he should not take the trouble to come again, for he said, "This slave apprehends lest the rights acquired by long service be destroyed, and the standard of greatness, which has been raised by enduring so much trouble and difficulty, be brought down at once."

to Islām Khān as given by Firishtah agrees generally with that in the text, but according to Firishtah, Shujā' Khān was one of the six and thirty and (not five and thirty) men who planted the standard of Salīm Shāh's (or Shēi Shah's) greatness.

¹ One MS. has by mistake حاضری instead of حاضر.

After some days when ¹ Shuja Khan bathed and alms and charity were distributed to the crying people he one day mounted his horse and went to make his *salam* to Islam Khan. The latter bestowed one hundred and one horses and one hundred and one packages of various stuffs of Bengal as rewards to the Khan. But as Shuja Khan found out from his manner and behaviour that these cajolries were filled with civility he passed the day in any way that was possible and then coming back to his quarters spoke to his servants that they should load his camp equipments. The people of the city thought that as that camping ground had become dirty he wanted to remove to another place. But when all his men had loaded up everything he armed himself and then ordered that they should beat the drum of departure. He then mounted his horse and took the road to Sirangpur. Islam Khan on seeing this became angry and detached a body of soldiers to pursue him and collecting his army he himself also advanced towards Sirangpur. On arrival at that place Shuja Khan commenced to equip his men and when he heard that Islam Khan was coming some of his men tried to "persuade him to fight with the latter. He however said: "Islam Khan is the son of my late master and benefactor. I shall never fight with him and I shall not allow that any one of my people should have such an intention in his mind. After the arrival of Islam Khan in the neighbourhood of Sirangpur Shuja Khan came out of the city and sending the families and dependants of his men in advance went away in the direction of Banswala.

Islam Khan took possession of Malwa and leaving Isi Khan Sur with twenty-two thousand horsemen in the town of Ujjain returned to Gwalior. Shuja Khan although he had the power and the necessary force never caused any damage to the country of Malwa. As Islam Khan (at this time) advanced towards Lahore on account of the rebellion of the Nizazis Daulat Khan Ajizala who was a favourite of Islam Khan and an adopted son of Shuja Khan prayed for the pardon of the guilt of the latter. Shuja Khan then came and rendered

¹ Apparently in the old days people did not bathe when they were ill or in a bad mood.

The word *حدال* in our MS and in the lith ed but it is *حدال* in the other MS. The latter reading is adopted in the text edition.

homage to Islām Khān, who drew the pen of forgiveness across the page of his offences, and bestowed Sārangpūr, and the country of Rāisīn, and some other *Mahals* (estates) on him. He also gave him one hundred and one horses and much stuff and a gold ewer and basin, and granted him permission to return. When Shujā' Khān went to his *jāgīr*, and Islām Khān, after a considerable time, passed away by natural death, and the *saltanat* was settled on Mubārīz Khān 'Adalī, the latter,¹ either on account of ancient acquaintance, or on account of the relationship of his being the husband of one of his wife's sisters, conferred the entire country of Mālwa permanently on him. Shujā' Khān then conferred the government of Ujjain and the *parganas* in its neighbourhood on Daulat Khān Ājīyālā, and Rāisīn and Bhīlsā on his youngest son² Malīk Mustafā, who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany Rāja Bīr Bal and Hakīm Abū-ul Fath in the Yūsuf Zāī expedition and was killed there. He gave the government of Hāndiyah and Āshta to Miyyān Bāyazīd, and himself took up his residence in Sārangpūr. When a long time had passed in this way, and disorders took place in the *saltanat* of Dehlī, and everyone became independent in the corner in which he was, Shujā' Khān passed away by a natural death.³ The period of the government of Shujā' Khān was 12 years.

⁴ AN ACCOUNT OF BAZ BAHĀDUR, SON OF SHUJĀ' KHĀN

After the death of Shujā' Khān, Bāyazīd, his eldest son, betook himself to Sārangpūr, and took possession of all his father's property and retainers. As Daulat Khān Ājīyālā, owing to the proximity of

¹ One MS omits the first چہ and substitutes نہایت for the second. Firsihtah in the corresponding passage has نسبت سابق اسلاف. I find that one of the meanings of اسلاف in the dictionary is "the husbands of a man's wife's sisters." I have taken the word to mean this in this passage.

² ملک مصطفیٰ in the text-edition. The clause corresponding to "who was (afterwards) appointed to accompany" and "and was killed there" is omitted in the text-edition.

³ According to Firsihtah he died in 962 A H. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 275) gives 1554 A D as the corresponding year, but the Cambridge History of India, page 371, places his death in 1555, after Humāyūn had regained the empire.

⁴ One MS omits سکاک حال.

his position to Islam Khan was ¹ respected and honoured by all men and every one was desirous of him (i.e. of his rule) Miyan Bayazid gave encouragement and made promises of favour to a number of men and sent his mother to Daulat Khan so that she might bring about some amicable arrangement. In the end they came to this decision that Daulat Khan should be in possession of the *sarkars* Ujjain and Mandu and some other states and Sarangpur and the *Khalsa Mahals* of Shuja Khan (i.e. the estates which he held in his own possession without the intervention of *jagirdars*) and the *sarkars* of Handiyah and Kothi Birah and the country of Bhilwarah should belong to Miyan Bayazid and the *sarkars* of Raisin and Bhilsa and other *Mahals* which were situated in that neighbourhood should be in the possession of Malik Mustafa. After that Miyan Bayazid intending to act treacherously went towards Ujjain and told people that he was going to wait on Miyan Daulat Khan to condole with him. Daulat Khan whose death was imminent was unconscious of the (intended) treachery and was killed. His head was sent to Sarangpur and was suspended from one of the gates.

After that he took possession of most of the territory of Malwa. He had the royal umbrella raised over his head and gave himself the title of Baz Bahadur Shah. After arranging the affairs of that side he advanced towards Raisin. Malik Mustafa who was distinguished by much courage and strength met him and after some warfare was defeated. Baz Bahadur then entrusted (the government of) Raisin and Bhilsa to his own men and advanced towards ² Kadrula. As

¹ One MS has مقرر by mistake instead of معزز.

The distribution given above appears in the MSS and in the lith ed. The only difference is that one MS has کوکی برالا while the other has کو مکی برالا and the lith ed has کو مکی برالا instead of کو مکی برالا. Firsihtah lith ed has a somewhat different distribution. According to him Daulat Khan and Malik Mustafa got the territory mentioned against their names in the text but Miyan Bayazid had Sarangpur and Siwas (Satwas) and Sirohi and Baralima and Bhilwarah and the *Khalsa Mahal* of Shuja Khan. Col Briggs (vol IV p 275) has practically the same distribution.

² The name is کدر والا and کدر والا in the MSS. The lith ed has نار گداسب instead of مدوحه کدرولا گسب. The name کدرولا however written further on. The name is not quite legible in the lith ed of Firsihtah but looks like کدرواله. Two or three lines further down the name is distinctly کدرواله.

that place was in the occupation of a band of *Miyānas* (*Miyāna Afghāns*) and he did not meet with such treatment from them as he desired he slew a number of ¹ their *sardārs*, who were accompanying him, by throwing them into wells, and then advanced to fight the rest of that band. They fortified themselves, and did not show themselves at all backward in fighting with him. Fath Khān the uncle-in-law of Bāz Bahādūr, some account of whom has been given before, received a cannon ² ball here and was killed. In the end Bāz Bahādūr took possession of Kadrūlā, and came back to Sārangpūr.

After sometime, he advanced with a well-equipped army, with the object of conquering *Garh Katinkah*. When he arrived in that country, Rānī Durgāwatī, who was the wife of the Rāja of Katinkah, and after his death ruled the country, collected the *Kōnduān* and commenced a battle at the head of the *Ghālī* (pass). As the Rānī's infantry were more numerous than ants and locusts, they surrounded the men from all sides of the *Ghālī*. Bāz Bahādūr in distress and dismay took the path of flight, and all his suite and equipages fell into the Rānī's hands. Many of his best men ³ remained there. He himself, with very great trouble, betook himself to Sārangpūr, and began to repair the damages and losses in his army.

As he had undergone much hardship, he now desired that he should spend some days in pleasure. He collected musicians and singers from every place where they were, and occupied himself all day and night in (sensual) pleasure and enjoyment.

⁴ Then in the months of the year ⁵ 967 A H, when the desire

The place is not mentioned by Col Briggs, but it is called Kelwāra in the Cambridge History of India, page 371. In the text edition M. Hidayat Hosam has adopted *کدوار*.

¹ Firishtah and Col Briggs do not say that it was the *sardārs* or *Miyānas* who were thrown into the well. Firishtah says *وچوں بعضی سرداران او ساوک*, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 277) says, "Having met with opposition from some of his officers", etc.

² The word is *توپ* in the text, and *گلوله* in Firishtah lith. ed.

³ Firishtah explains *اکثر بقتل آمدند*, i.e., most of these men were slain.

⁴ The sentence begins with *تا آنکه*, but as it would hardly be possible to begin a paragraph with "Till in the, etc." I have begun it with "Then, etc."

⁵ The MSS. have *و تسعمائة و سبعين*, i.e., 977 A H, which is incorrect. Firishtah lith. ed. has *و تسعين*, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 278)

of conquering Mālwa found a place in the head which touched the sky of His Majesty the Khalifā ilāhī may God perpetuate the shadow of his kindness over the people! he sent Adham Khān and Pir Muhammad Khān and Sidiq Khān¹ and Qiya Khān and Shāh Muhammad Khān Qandaharī and his son Ādil Muhammad and Muhib Ali Khān and a number of others from among his servants to effect it. The great *amirs* advanced towards Sirangpur by successive marches. When they arrived in the neighbourhood of the village of Kutur which is one *farsukh* from Sirangpur Baz Bahadur rose from the company of the singing women and marched forward to fight with brave men. Although a large number of Afghāns who had performed many feats of arms and seen much fighting were collected together in his service yet as good fortune was not his guide he fled after a little fighting and that country came into the possession of the servants of the triumphant greatness (i.e. the empire of Akbar). The details of this battle² and the remaining battles which took place in Mālwa have been narrated distinctly and in detail in the history of His Majesty the Khalifā ilāhī. May God perpetuate His benevolence and favour on the people and may God prolong the days of his life to the day of resurrection!

Baz Bahadur had a wife Rupmatī by name³ who loved him and was enamoured of him and in the verses which he composed in the Hindī language he often inserted her name. He had a great passion for the society of women and the company of musicians.

He ruled in the country of Mālwa for a period of sixteen years. After his flight from the country of Mālwa he went to Gujrat. He next

has in the latter end of the year 968 A.H. 1560 A.D. The Cambridge History of India page 371 has 1561

¹ One MS. omits Qiya Khān

The name is written in كندور in one MS. and the lith. ed. and كندور in the other MS. Firhtah does not give the name of the place but says when the Mughal army got to one *karoh* from Sirangpur and Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 8) has written a short distance of its capital when he collected his troops around Sarangpoor but they had hardly time to join before the Moguls were within two miles of the place.

² One MS. omits the word اندک

³ The same MS. omits the conjunction and

⁴ It is not quite clear whether the author means that Rupmatī loved Baz Bahadur and was enamoured of him or vice versa

went to the Rānā, who was the ruler of the fort of Kōnbhalmīr and Chitōr from Guṛāt, and from there, he went and waited on His Majesty the K̲halīfa-i-Ilāhī, and was enrolled in the band of his servants. He remained in that service for several years, till he surrendered the deposit of his life. The country of Mālwa is up to the present day in the possession of the Viceroys of this daily increasing power.

SECTION IX ¹ THE SECTION ABOUT THE SULTĀNS OF KASHMĪR

From the year ² 747 A H to the year 995 A H, 249 years ³ was the period of the rule of the Musalmān Sultāns in the country of Kashmīr. ⁴ The beginning was from Āl-i-Tāhīr.

⁵ Let it not remain concealed that the country of Kashmīr was always in the possession of Rājas, who ruled ⁶ one after another, till the year 750 A H, which was in the time of the rule of ⁷ Rāja Sirdēv.

¹ The heading in the text is that in the lith ed. The headings in the MSS are طنقه حکام کسمیر نقر and طنقه حکام سلاطین نقر, which are both incorrect.

² As regards the chronology of the Musalmān Kings of Kashmīr, see page 100 of *J A S B*, vol. LIV (1885), where Mr. C. J. Rogers working back from 795 A H, the date of the death of Kutub-ud-Dīn, places the accession of Shams-ud-Dīn or Shāh Mīr in 743 A H. This differs from the year in the text by four years.

³ The words from مدت to ال طاهر do not occur in one MS. The other MS and the lith ed have them with slight variations. I have adopted the words in the first MS, but in the text edition the last sentence (see note 4 below) is omitted.

⁴ This sentence is written as ابتداء ار ال طاهر in one MS. It is not to be found in any other MS or the text edition.

⁵ In the text edition M. Hidayat Hosain inserts the heading ذکر حکومت above this line and not a page or so later as in the translation.

⁶ One MS has by mistake ار سی ام instead of ار سی بکدنگر.

⁷ The name is written as سردنو Sirdēv and سردنوا Sirdēvā in the MS and سردیو in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has سده دیو Siah Dev. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 451) has Sena Dew, and the Cambridge History of India, page 277, has Sinha Deva. According to Jonarāja's Chronicle, line 129, Rāja Simhadeva died in his 77th year after reigning for fourteen years and three days less than six months and was succeeded by his brother Sūhadeva. It was in

a man of the name of ¹ Shah Mir who described his ancestry as follows Shah Mir son of Tahrir Āl son of - Karshashab son of Nekruz and referred the end (or rather the beginning) of his ancestry to Arjun who was of the Pandus and the history of the Pandus is mentioned in the Mahabharat which has been translated by the order of His

his reign that many people came from distant countries in quest of service سردار in the text edition

¹ The name is شاه مير Shah Mir in both MSS and in the lith ed It is Shah Meer in Col Briggs (vol IV p 451) but it is شاه ميرزا Shah Mirza in the lith ed of Firishtah and in the Cambridge History of India In the books in the somewhat imposing list of the Bibliography page 650 to Chapter xii of the Cambridge History of India vol III which deals with the history of the Kingdom of Kashmir there is only one mention of the name of the man and this is on page 130 of the Introduction in Sir Aurel Stein's translation of Kalhana's *Rajatarangini* vol I (1900) In this place he is called Shah Mir so it is difficult to find where Sir Wolseley Haig who compiled the account in the Cambridge History of India got his authority for calling him Shah Mirza In the *J R 4 S* vol L (1918 pp 451-468) there is a paper called the Chronology and genealogy of the Muhammadan kings of Kashmir which is also mentioned in the Bibliography and which is also written by the same author Lt Col T W Haig In this paper he says My materials chiefly consist of the *Tabaquit* Akbari Colonel Jarrat's excellent translation of the *Āin-i-Akbari* and Firishtah's history But as regards Firishtah he says that he is little more than a copyist of Nizam al-din Ahmad and yet he has adopted the Shah Mirza of Firishtah in preference to the Shah Mir of Nizam ud-din It may be mentioned that very probably there are MSS of Firishtah in which the man is called Shah Mir for Col Briggs as remarked above calls him Shah Meer

In Jonaraja's Chronicle already referred to in the preceding note the name occurs in line 13 and in different lines further down It is there written as शमिर so that Shah Mir is in every way more correct than Shah Mirza I cannot find anything distinct about his being a descendant of Arjuna but one of his ancestors is called (l 13) Partha who was like another Partha (a name of Arjuna) पार्थिव्य एव पाथ It is also stated that it had been said there that the descendants of Kuru Śaha would rule the empire of Kashmir (l 135)

The ancestry given in the text is given with slight differences in Firishtah and also by Col Briggs (vol IV p 45^o) but the latter in a footnote says it is surprising that a person of Firishita's sagacity should have overlooked the evident absurdity of the pedigree The Cambridge History of India page 77 describes him as an adventurer from Swat and Firishtah says he came in the dress of a *fagīr* In the text edition بن ال ساسب has been retained between بن کرساسب and طاعمرال

Majesty, the K̥halifā-i-Ilāhī, and has been called the *Rāzm Nāma*, who came and became a servant of the Rāja, and having served him for a considerable period, acquired some credit. When Rāja Śudēva died, ¹ his son Rāja Rañjan made Shāh Mī his *vazīr*, and left the charge of the work of the government with him. He also entrusted the guardianship of his son who had the name of ² Chandar to him. When Rāja Rañjan died, ³ Rāja Adwan or (Āndan) who was a relation of his came from Qandahār and sat on the seat of authority and made Shāh Mī, who was still the guardian of Chandar son of Rāja Rañjan, his *valīl* (representative or agent). He placed reliance on his two sons one of whom was named ⁴ Jamshīd and the other Alī Shēr,

¹ The name is راجه رجن in one MS and in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqūt* and راجه رجن in the other MS. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 152) calls him Raja Runjun the son and successor of Raja Sena Dew. The *Cambridge History of India* page 277 however says that the authority of Sinha Deva was overthrown and he was slain by Rinchhan, a Tibetan who had been in his service. This is correct for according to *Jonarāja* line 147 *et seq.*, the *Bhotta* (which is the name uniformly given to the Tibetan inhabitants of the Indus region) Rincana usurped the throne of Kashmīr. See also page 408 of Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol. II. The name should be spelt as Rinchhan and not Rinchhan, as in the *Cambridge History of India*. He is said to have reigned for three years and eleven days less than two months.

² The name is written as چدر in both MSS but it is in the lith. ed. It is also चैदर in *Jonarāja*, line 221. I do not know whether it is a transformation of the Musalmān name of Haidar or an indigenous name.

³ The name is written as راجه اوده or راجه اودن in the MS and the lith. eds. of the *Tabaqūt* and *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 152) calls him Anund Dew. The *Cambridge History of India*, page 277, has Udayana Deva. Col. Briggs says he came from Kashghar, and the *Cambridge History of India* says he had found an asylum in Kishtwār which appears from the *Āin-i-Ālbarī* (Jarrat's translation, vol. II, p. 310, footnote 7) to have been situated in "the Kashmīr state latitude 33° 18' 37" north, longitude 75° 48' east, near the left bank of the Chenab." Qandahār from which he is said, according to the text to have come must be taken to mean here and elsewhere the ancient Gandhāra and not the modern Qandahār.

He is called Udayanadeva in *Jonarāja*, line 223. He however, appears to have been a mere figure-head, who acted entirely as Kotā Dēvī, who possessed all the power, ordered him. See line 226 — धीरिवासी तदा कोटा देवी सर्वाधिकारिणी । राजा देह इवात्यर्थं तदादिष्ट समाचरत् ।

⁴ *Jonarāja* calls them ज्येश्ठर and अक्षेष्ठर, but elsewhere Jamshīd is called जसर. He also says that Udayanadeva gratified them by giving them the government of Kramarājya and other districts.

and made them men of authority. Shah Mir had two other sons also one called ¹ Sher Āshamak and the other named Hindal and they also aspired to greatness.

When Shah Mir and his sons became powerful and turbulent Raja Adwan Dev was annoyed with them in connection with certain matters and forbade them to come to his house. Shah Mir and his sons having taken possession of all the *parganas* of Kashmir made most of the servants of the Pujā join them and they acquired fresh strength and power day by day. Raja Adwan also became weaker till in the year 747 A.H. he passed away and his widow ² Kopa Devi took his place so that she might rule with absolute power. She sent a message to Shah Mir to raise Chandra son of Raja Ranjan to power. Shah Mir did not agree with this and did not obey her. So she advanced with a large army but was taken prisoner and the purport of the hemistich

When death to the prey has come it to the hunter goes became apparent. ³ After that she accepted Shah Mir for her husband and became converted to Islam. They passed one day and night together. The next day Shah Mir seized and imprisoned her and having raised the standard of the empire and having had the public

¹ The name is written differently and not very legibly. It is سر آسا and سر اسامک in MS and سر ساء in the lith. ed. Firhtah lith. ed. has سر اسامک. The name is not mentioned by Col Brigg or in the Cambridge History of India (at this place) but further on is referred as Shirī hamak.

Firhtah also give the same year but Col Brigg (vol IV p 153) has 746 A.H. 136 A.D. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the year.

² The name is written کونا دیوی and کونا دیوی in the MSS and کونا دیوی in the lith. ed. Firhtah lith. ed. has کونا دیوی. Col Brigg (p 43) has Ranv Kowla Devi and the Cambridge History of India (p 247) has Kōta Devi. Cōpā and Kōwla (Kamala) have some meaning in Sanskrit but Kōtal has none. Gopā Devi it will be remembered was the name of the wife of prince Siddharta or the Gautama Buddha and it is quite probable that it should have been the name of the queen of Raja Udayana. As it happens however the name is Kōtal Devi in Jonarjā line 14 etc.

³ There are variations in the readings. I have adopted that in the lith. ed. The e in the MSS are defective. One is کد ساء منورا قبول کردہ بسوهری و the other is کد ساء منورا قبول کردہ اسلام آورد.

prayers read and the coins struck in his own name, gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn. As the commencement of the appearance of the Hanafī religion in the country of Kashmīr was from his time, the beginning of the section about Kashmīr has been made from that time.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN

In short, when Sultān Shams-ud-dīn attained to sovereignty, he discontinued all ² the customs of oppression and tyranny, which had continued from preceding rulers. Having assured his mind from (the attempts of) the enemy, he rebuilt anew the whole kingdom of Kashmīr, which had been devastated by slaughter and rapine of ³ Diljū, and gave a written assurance to the *ra'īyats* that he would not take from them a larger revenue than ⁴ the sixth part of the produce.

Verses

The standard of the *Bādshāh*, the cherisher of the faith,
Cast its mighty shadow over all the world,
The messengers of the sky conveyed
The news of his justice to countries all
The body of disturbance became weak and thin,
The house of oppression into ruin fell

As the acclamation of the bravery and the good name of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn became noised about in all directions, he occupied himself in the work of the government according to the rites of the parties,

¹ The heading in the text is that of one MS. The other MS omits the heading altogether. The lith. ed. inserts حکومت after ذکر.

² Firishtah and Col. Briggs agree generally. The Cambridge History of India (p. 277) is rather eloquent about the atrocities and tyranny of the Hindu rulers. They were very probably bad enough, but the Cambridge History of India does not give any authority for its diatribe and is altogether silent about the plunder and slaughter by Diljū which was the chief cause of the exactions and tyranny of the Rājās.

³ Like the *Tabaqāt Firishtah* calls him the *Mīr Bālshī* (or pay master general) of Qandahār, but Col. Briggs calls him the chief of Kashghar. He is called Daljū in the *Āin-e-Albani* (Jarrat, vol. II, p. 387, note 1) and Zuljū by Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 98).

⁴ The *Sasthāmśa* of the ancient Hindu kings.

and seized a body of the ¹ Lun tribe who had become hostile to him in Kishtwar and meted out punishment to them

They say that Dilju was the *Mir Bakhsu* (pay master general) of Qandahar. He came with all the army to Kashmir and turned the whole of the country upside down and Raja Sirdev having collected a large sum of money as assessment from his subjects sent it as a tribute to Diljū and then secluded himself in a corner and thus ruined the entire country of Kashmir. And as Dilju could not stay there owing to excessive cold he returned to Qandahar.

After he had acquired stability and firmness he left all affairs to Jamshid and Ali Shēr his two sons and occupied himself with repose and worship and ² he passed away. The period of his reign was three years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN JAMSHID SON OF SULTĀN SHAMS UD DĪN

When Sultān ³ Shams ud dīn accepted the summons of the just God and Sultān Jamshid ascended the throne with the concurrence of the chief men of the state he always took every precaution (to guard himself) from Ali Sher who during their father's lifetime had

¹ The *e* are the old Lavanyas for an account of whom see Steins *Rajatarangini* vol II p 306

Firishtah lith ed and the Cambridge History of India page 377 say he reigned for 3 years. Col Briggs (vol IV p 454) makes it 23 years by mistake. According to Jonaraja the exact period was three years and five days (see l 315).

Firishtah mentions here a matter of some social and official importance which I have thought it necessary to note. He remarks *ار مردم دو طائفه را کلاں صاحب یکی حک و دیگری ناکری و فرار داد که امرا و سناهی ان ملک اکثر ارباب* which may be translated as among the people (of Kashmir) he made two communities great one *Chak* and the other *Bakri* he decided that the *amirs* and the soldiers of that country should be (selected) chiefly from these two classes. This is also mentioned by Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 99) who however transliterates the names as Chalks and Malari.

I find that the Chaks were called the *Cakreśas* or *Cakras* in the Kashmir Chronicles. Kaji Chal who was the first of Chaks to rise to some eminence was mentioned as *Kancana Cakreśa* and elsewhere *Kaca Cakra*. I am not so sure about the name of the Makris in the Chronicles but they were probably the *Marg śa*.

³ One MS omits the name Sultan Shams ud dīn.

acted jointly with him in all affairs. In fact, the two were always trying to effect the destruction of each other. When Jamshīd's soldiers collected round 'Alī Shēi, and raising him on the throne sat down at ¹ Walipūr, which is a famous city, Jamshīd marched against them with his army and summoned them in the first instance with mildness and courtesy, and tried to have an amicable settlement. 'Alī Shēi turning his head from the proposals of peace, marched on wings of speed, and made a night attack on Jamshīd's army, and defeated it. When Sultān Jamshīd after suffering the defeat, heard that Walipūr was unoccupied (by 'Alī Shēi's troops), he, with the intention of devastating it, advanced towards it. 'Alī Shēi's soldiers, who had orders to guard and defend it, met him in battle, but most of them were slain. In the meantime, when 'Alī Shēr, ² after his victory arrived in those parts, Sultān Jamshīd seeing, that he had not the strength to meet him, fled to the country of ³ Kamrāj, and

¹ The name cannot be made out distinctly in either the MS or in the lith ed, but appears to be *ولی نور* Walipūr or *ونی نور* Wanipūr. Firishtah lith ed has Madnipūr, and Col Briggs (vol IV p 455) has Mednypoor, but I cannot find either Walipūr or Mednipūr as the name of any well known city in Kashmir. Probably Utpalapura is meant (see Jonarāja, l 323) or Avantipura (see Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol II, p 460). In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has *دنی نور* Danipūr.

² Both MSS have *فتح مودہ*, and I have adopted it, but the lith ed has *فتح و ضروری حود*.

³ The MSS and the lith ed have *کراج*. Firishtah has *کمراج*, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 455) has Gujraj. I find Kamrāj and Kamrāz mentioned in Stein's *Rājataranginī*. Kamrāj, is Abū l Fazl's Western half of the Kingdom (pp 436, 494) and Kamrāz or the territorial division the old Kramarājya and consisting of 18 *parganas* (p 494).

Madava Rājya I find is written in Sanskrit as *मदवा-राज्य*. It appears that according to the general prevailing notion Maraz comprises the districts on both sides of the Vitastā above Srinagar, and Kamrāz those below. In Akbar's time the old *parganas* of Uttar Lolau Hamal and Mach'pur were embodied in the *tauzi pargana* of Kamrāz (see Jarrat's *Āin-i-Akbarī*, vol II, p 371). In Moorcraft's and Baron Hugel's list, the *pargana* Kamrāz includes Uttar Hamal and Mach'pur. Owing to frequent changes of *pargana* divisions, the extent of the *pargana* Kamrāz has also varied from time to time (*vide* Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol II, p 436, note 2). I have inserted Kamrāj in the text instead of Karāj. Haig does not mention Kamrāj either in the Cambridge History of India or in his paper in the *J R A S*, vol L (1918).

his *amir* Siraj who had the defence of Srinagar in his charge summoned Ali Sher from the city of ¹ Uchh and made Srinagar over to him Jamshid after this catastrophe did not again gird up his loins and after ruling for ² one year and two months passed away

⁴ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ALĀ UD DĪN

When Sultan Jamshid passed away his ⁵ younger brother who had the name of Ali Sher assumed the title of Sultan Ala ud din and sat on the throne He conferred full powers on his younger brother Sher Āshamak In the beginning of his reign there was great plenty ⁶ but towards the end there was a great famine and an immense number of people perished ⁷ He got hold of a body of Rasturis who had become hostile to him and had gone away to Kishtawar by various devices and bringing them into Kashmir imprisoned them He raised the standard of his power and laid the foundation of ⁸ a city which he called after his own name near Yehiypur Among the rules

¹ The name is *أوحه* in one MS and in the lith ed but *أخوڊنه* in the other MS Neither Firishtah nor Col Briggs mentions the place I cannot find any thing about Uchh or Ayodhya

The reading are somewhat different One MS has *کمر* the other has apparently by mistake *کمر بس* while the lith ed has *کمر رسب* lived for a short time Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *کمره بسنه* I have adopted *کمره بسب*

² Jonaraja makes this period one year and ten months (l 338)

⁴ The heading in the MS is as I have it in the text The lith ed has *در ذکر حکومت سلطان علاء الدین*

⁵ One MS and the lith ed have *کهنوس* but the other MS has *کهنر*

⁶ One MS has by mistake *سدد* for *سد* after *فراوانی سنار* and omits the sentence from *و در آخر* to *لف سدد* The famine is mentioned by Jonaraja (l 308)

⁷ Firishtah also says this but does not mention the name of the tribe I cannot identify it in Jonaraja

⁸ I cannot identify the name of the city which appears to be *یہی پور* Yehiypur in the MS and *یہی پور* which may be anything in the lith ed Jonaraja however says the Sultan built a bridge near Suryapura (e l 340) probably a printer's mistake for Suryapura and made Jay pidapura his capital (l 30)

promulgated by him was one, that an unchaste woman should ¹ not inherit her husband's property

The period of his rule was ² twelve years and eight months and thirteen days

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ³ SHIHĀB-UD-DĪN, SON OF SULTĀN
SHAMS-UD-DĪN

When Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn had traversed the stages of life, his younger brother, who had the name of Shēr Āshāmak attained to the *saltanat* after him. He was a man of resolution and bravery, and had pleasant manners and morals. ⁴ Any day on which a report of a victory did not come from some direction, that day he did not ⁵ count as one of the days in his life, and on such a day marks of pain appeared on his ⁶ countenance. He made over the demarcated country to the old *mālks* (owners), and marched with his army to the banks of the river Sind. ⁷ They say that when the ruler of that country came and

¹ Both the MSS have 'ارب نبرد' The lith ed has 'ارب نبرد' This is better and I have retained it

² This agrees with Jonarāja (l 359)

³ He is called *शिवदीन* by Jonarāja, so that whatever the correct pronunciation of the name might be there can be no doubt as to what he was called. *Shmasama*, as has been pointed out, means a little milk-drinker, and was probably a childish nickname

⁴ This fact is mentioned even more emphatically by Jonarāja, who says that any moment in which he did not gain a victory he counted as lost for nothing, and who further expatiates on his ambition for victory, and his numerous expeditions, which were as dear to him as a young wife is to an old man, and which neither cold nor heat nor evening nor night nor hunger nor thirst could interfere with. Neither a fawn-eyed fair one, nor the pleasures of wine nor the moonlight could charm his mind like a military expedition. No river was difficult to cross, nor any mountain difficult to climb nor any desert impossible to traverse (lines 365 to 368)

⁵ *دانست* in the text edition

⁶ The word is *شرة* which means the outer skin, the surface, and also humanity and constitution. Probably the word complexion would best express the meaning

⁷ According to Jonarāja his first expedition was towards the north, and he entered Udabhāndapura (Waihand or Und) on the Indus, the capital of Gandhāra (l 372 etc). It appears to me that when Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah speak of the residents of Qandahār being in terror of him they refer

engaged him in battle he was defeated and the residents of Qandahar and Ghazni were always in terror of him. He marched as far as ¹ Āshnagar which is now known as Āshnagar and ² Peshawar and slew an immense number of his enemies. He had gone as far as the ⁴ foot hills of the Hindukush (but) on account of the hardships of the road he after undergoing much privations returned. He then made an encampment on the bank of the river Sutlej. The Raja of Nagarkōt who had ravaged some of the estates appertaining to Dehli and was returning rendered homage to the Sultān on the way and having surrendered to him the whole of the vast quantity of the booty which he had seized made his submission to him. The ruler of ⁶ Tibet also waited on him and prayed that the Sultān's army might not cause any injury to his territories.

After he had conquered all the surrounding countries he took up his abode in his capital. He made his younger brother whose name

not to the present Qandahar which was far away. As Udabhandapura was the capital of Gandhara they may very well have called it Qandahar. The ruler of Sindhu (Sind) gave his daughter in marriage to him (l. 34). In line 37 Gajunipuri (Ghazni) is mentioned as being frightened on hearing the lion like roars of the lion king's army. Then he marched southwards and refreshed his tired horses by (bathing them in the cooling) waters of the *Sutadru* or Sutlej (l. 38).

¹ The name looks like ناسب نكر and اسب نكر in the MSS and the lith ed has سب نكر. Firishtah lith ed has اسب نكر and Col Briggs (vol IV p. 458) has Ashnuggur.

The name here looks like ناس نكر and فاس نكر in the MSS and ناس نكر in the lith ed. The lith ed of Firishtah has اس نكر. Col Briggs does not give the more recent name. I have not been able to identify the place.

² The name is written as نرسادر and نرسار in the MSS and as نرسادر in the lith ed.

⁴ I have not been able to find anything about his marching to the Hindukush mountains in Jonaraja.

⁵ The encounter with the Raja of Nagarkot appears to be referred to in the somewhat curious lines (383 etc.) according to which the Raja Udakpati is said to have pillaged Philli (दिहली) which may be a misprint for दिहली but I have not been able to find any account anywhere in Jonaraja of Raja Udakpati or any connection between him and Nagarkot.

⁶ The MSS have طبب and نبب and the lith ed has ل ل. Firishtah has نبب كوكبك little Tibet.

was Hīndāl, his hen, and he banished ¹ Hasan and his brother, who were both his legitimate sons, towards Dehlī, at the dictation of another wife of his who had ill-feeling with their mother.

He founded two cities called ² Lachmīnagar and Shihābpūr, and then passed away.

The period of his rule was twenty years.

³ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QUTB-UD-DĪN, SON OF SHAMS-UD-DĪN.

When Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn rolled up the bed of his life, his brother, who was named Hīndāl, succeeded him on the throne. He was possessed of pleasant manners and morals, and made very good arrangements for compliance of his orders. He sent a ⁴ *sardār* of the name of Loār for the conquest of the fort of Loharkōt, which was in the possession of some of the *amīrs* of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn. After several great battle had taken place between the two sides, the *sardār*

¹ Firishtah calls them Hasan Khān and 'Alī Khān. There is no mention anywhere, of the reason for their banishment. Jonarāja (I 438) says:

रागी तद्दोषवादिन्या तथा देव्या प्रबोधितः ।

अवास्यत् स्वदेशात् स राजपुत्रान् परानिव ॥

² I cannot find anything about Lachmīnagar or Shihābpūr, in the text-edition the former is لاجمیناگر Lajhmīnagar.

³ The heading in both MSS is as I have in the text. The heading in the lith ed is ذکر حکومت هندال بن شمس الدین. The name Qutb-ud-dīn has been transformed by Jonarāja to कुम्भदीन, Kumbhadīna (I 462).

⁴ The readings here are somewhat different and obscure. One MS has لوار نام سرداری را. This I consider the best reading and have adopted it. The other MS has بوداو نام سرداری را and the lith ed has سرداری را (indistinct). Firishtah lith ed has در آخر سلطنت سرداری را which cannot be correct, as this is stated in the beginning of the account of the reign. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 460) following Firishtah says, "In the latter part of his reign he deputed an officer." The Cambridge History of India, page 278, says, "A rebellion of some of his predecessor's officers obliged him to send an expedition which was successful, for the recovery of the fortress of Lokarkot." I can find no authority for the statement that the expedition was successful. Both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah say that the commander sent by Qutb-ud-dīn was slain.

As to the position, etc of the fort of Loharkōt (Loharakotta) or the castle of Lohara which the expedition was sent to conquer, see *Rājataranginī*, vol. II, p. 293. بوداو Būdāo is the name of the *sardār* in the text edition.

was slain And he sent for his nephew Hasan son of Shihab ud din from Dehli and wanted to make him his heir and successor but envious people made him repent of this decision and incited him ¹ to seize him One of the *amirs* of the Sultan who was named ² Ray Rawal informed Hasan of this and ³ he fled to Loharkōt with Hasan by way of Kashmir After that the *zamindars* seized both of them and sent them to the Sultan Ray Rawal was executed and Hasan was cast into prison

In the later years of his life two sons were born to the Sultan One was called ⁴ Sikar and the other Haibat Khan Both these sons were young when the Sultan ⁵ passed away from the world

The period of his rule was fifteen years and five months

¹ One MS and the lith ed have *بر گزین او* to seize him but the other MS has *بر کشتن او* to slay him which appears to be a mistake this however has been adopted in the text edition

The name is written as *رای زاول* in one MS In the other MS and in the lith ed it is *روی زاول* Firishtah lith ed has by mistake *رای ول را* Col Briggs (vol IV p 460) has Ray Rawul The Cambridge History of India page 478 does not mention his name but calls him a Hindu courtier Both Nizam ud din and Firishtah say that the Sultan attempted to seize Hasan at the instigation of envious people Col Briggs (*loc cit*) however says

He became so popular as to excite the King's jealousy while the Cambridge History of India says his impatience exceeded his gratitude and he conspired with a Hindu courtier against his patron

³ There are slight difference in the readings One MS and the lith ed have *و با حسن او راه کسمبر قرار سده بلوهر کوپ رفت* With this difference that the lith ed has *نموده* in place of *سده* this is adopted in the text edition The other MS omits the first word from which it would appear that Hasan alone fled to Loharkot but this is not correct a thus MS as well as the other and the lith ed all say that the *zamindars* seized both of them and sent them to the Sultan

⁴ The name is *سکار* and *سنگار* in the MSS and *سکا* in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has *سکار* Col Briggs (vol IV p 461) has Sugga and the Cambridge History of India page 479 Sakar or Sankar It appears from Jonaraja line 31 that he was called Srugara and (not Sikandar as suggested by Haig on p 444 of the *JRAS* vol L 1918) of which Sikar etc are corruptions The other was named Haibat Khan according to the MS etc and Haibata according to Jonaraja line 533

⁵ Firishtah lith ed gives 796 A H as the year of his death while Col Briggs has 799 A H 1396 A D The Cambridge History of India page 29

¹AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR, THE ICONOCLAST, THE SON OF
QUTB-UD-DĪN, THE SON OF SHAMS-UD-DĪN, WHO HAD THE NAME
OF SĪKĀR

In concert with the *vazīrs* and *amīrs* he sat in his father's place, and ² taking up the management of affairs into his own hands,

has 1394 Firishtah also says that Mir Saiyid 'Alī Hamadānī came to Srinagar in the reign of Qutb ud din, was received with great honour and respect, and many people of the country became his true disciples. Firishtah also says that, according to Mirza Haidar Dughlat's book, he remained in Kashmīr for a little more than forty days, and then went back to his cherished native place, but Firishtah thinks that the great *Khānqā*, which was built by him in Srinagar, could not have been completed in forty days, and, therefore, if he remained there for only forty days its foundations alone might have been laid down in his presence and it must have been completed after his departure.

The statement of Firishtah about Mīr Saiyid 'Alī Hamadānī's stay does not appear to be correct. From the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* (Elias & Denison Ross, 1895, pp 432, 433) it appears, that he was expelled from Persia by Timur and it appears from Mr Beale's account (*Oriental Biog Dictionary*, p 238) that he came with seven hundred Saiyids to Kashmīr in 1380, and died in Pakhlī in 1386. Mirza Haider Dughlat in the *Tarikh i Rashidi*, however, says that Kutb-ud din died in less than forty days, which is somewhat ambiguous, but which really probably means that he died less than forty days after the arrival of the Saiyid.

¹ The heading in the MSS is as I have in the text. That in the lith ed is different, it is *ذکر حکومت سلطان سکندر کہ سکا نام داست*. The Sanskritised form of the name as given by Jonarāja is *शैकन्धर* (l 539).

² According to Firishtah, however, Sikandar's mother acted as the regent in the early part of his reign. I cannot find the mother's name in the lith ed of Firishtah, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 462) calls her Soorut Rany, and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, Sūra. According to Jonarāja, however see lines 539, 543, her correct name appears to have been Subhatā or Sobhā. She is called Subhatā Devī or Śrī Sobhā Mahādevī. She appears to have been an extremely stern, if not a cruel woman, for finding that her son-in-law Muhammad Shāh (called *सहपुत्र सहभद्र* in l 540 in Jonarāja), was against her son, she caused him and his wife, her own daughter, to be murdered. At her instigation also, probably Rāy Mādārī, a leading nobleman caused prince Haibat Khān, Sikandar's younger brother, to be poisoned. The name of the nobleman is Rāy Mādārī (with slight variations) in the MSS and the lith ed of the Tabaqāt and also in the lith ed of Firishtah. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 462) has "the prime minister Ray Makry" and the Cambridge History of India, page 279, has Rāi Madārī, which however is incorrect, the correct transliteration being Rāy Mādārī. I cannot find any name in Jonarāja which

¹ sent Ray Madari the *raur* who possessed much power to Tibet. He conquered that country and having collected a large army rebelled against his master. There was a battle in the neighbourhood of

Bhimbar. Ray Madari was defeated and captured and thrown into prison where he killed himself. Immense armies collected round the Sultan and all the surrounding countries were conquered by him.

At this time when His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunctions Amir Timur sent ³ an elephant for the Sultan the latter was very

has any resemblance to Ray Madari. There are two ministers mentioned by him called Uddaka and Sahaka (l. 39) and it was Uddaka who killed Muhammad Shah and his wife (l. 40) and poisoned Haibat Khan (l. 543) and afterwards killed his colleague Sahaka (l. 544).

¹ According to Firishtah Sikandar and Ray Madari distrusted each other. Ray Madari becoming aware of Sikandar's feeling towards him suggested that he might be allowed to march to conquer little Tibet, his object being that he might in this way be safe from the fire of Sikandar's anger and Sikandar agreed as he hoped that Ray Madari might be slain in the war. Accordingly Ray Madari invaded Tibet and gradually conquered the whole country. Having in this way become very powerful he rebelled against Sikandar. The latter marched against him and a battle took place near the boundary of the two countries. Ray Madari was defeated and fled but he later fell into the hand of Sikandar's troops. He was thrown into prison and after a time killed himself by taking poison. Jonaraja however says he cut his own throat. निजयैव क्षपायाथ स्वमलच्छेदमाचरेत् line 554. روی نادری in the text edition is apparently a misprint.

² The name of the place where the battle took place is written as نسر Binbar in one MS. In the other it is not very legible but looks like حر سر Jazsar. In the lith. ed. it is written as نسر. It is not mentioned by Firishtah or any other historians as far as I have seen except Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 463) who calls it the town of Nere. The battle, the flight of Ray Madari or Uddaka and his capture are mentioned by Jonaraja (l. 49 and the following lines) but I cannot discover the name of the place where the battle took place. نسر in the text edition.

³ The MSS. do not give the number of the elephants; they are very imperfect. One has فرسناد و فیل برای without any mention of the person for whom it or they were sent. The other is better; it has فرسناد سلطان و فیل برای. The lith. ed. has فرسناد و فیل برای سلطان from which it would appear only one elephant was sent. Firishtah however says Timur sent his emissaries with two elephants. Jonaraja also says that Timur, whom he describes curiously enough as क्षेप्राज

proud of this fact, and sent a petition to the Lord of the Conjunctions, containing expressions of his devotion and service. He also wrote that he would wait upon His Majesty, whenever he might be ordered to do so. He sent back the ambassadors after showing them very great favours. When (the expression of) the relation of this attachment and service was reported to the Lord of the Conjunctions, the latter declared his friendship for him, and sent a robe of honour of gold embroidery with a horse and a jewelled saddle, and ordered

sent two elephants to the King of Kashmīr, being afraid of the latter. The whole passage (lines 559-560) is so curious that I have thought it best to quote it

तदैव दीनाभरणमपालकतया युताम् ।

स्नेच्छराजो व्यधात् दिल्ली विधवामिव लुण्ठयन् ॥

तत' प्रत्याव्रजन् स्नेच्छराज' कश्मीरभूपते ।

शङ्कमानो गजेन्द्रौ द्वावुपायनमचीकरत् ॥

In another place Dehli was spelt as दिल्ली and here it is spelt as दिल्ली, and the comparison of Dehli with a widow, who being without a ruler had only poor and wretched ornaments, and a great world conquerer Timūr being afraid of the King of Kashmīr are extremely curious. I have looked in Jonarāja for further references to Timūr but have not been able to find them.

Firishtah and Col Briggs's account of the correspondence between Timūr and Sultān Sikandar agrees with that in the text, but they increase the amount of the tribute, which Timūr's *vazīrs* had stated would be required, to three thousand horses and one hundred thousand 'Alāi *ashrafīs*. The Cambridge History of India, page 279, does not say that Timūr sent any elephant to Sikandar, but it says (following the *Zafarnāma*) that his grandson Rustam and Mu'tamad Zain-ud-dīn who had been sent to Sikandar from Dehli as envoys (with what object does not appear) arrived and joined Timūr's camp near Jammū. They reported that they had been well received, and had been sent back with Maulānā Nūr-ud-dīn as the envoy of Sikandar. The latter was informed by Timūr's courtiers that Sikandar would be required to send thirty thousand horses and one hundred thousand golden *Dirhams*. This is perfectly correct, but the *Zafarnāma* does not use the word *Dirham* but the words

صد هزار درست ۛ It is difficult to say which of these various accounts is correct. It may be noted that it is said in the *Āin i-Akbarī* (Jarrat, vol II, p 387) that Sikandar on his way to Taimūr's camp, heard that it was reported in the camp, that he was bringing a present of a thousand horses, and concerned at the untruthfulness of this report he went back and sent his excuses. In Rodger's account (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 101) it is said that Sikandar was informed by some of Taimūr's servants, that he must give at least three thousand horses and one hundred thousand *ashrafīs*.

that when the great standard should return from Dehli towards the Punjab he should come and wait upon him. In accordance with this order Sultān Sikandar started with much tribute to attend on him when His Majesty was advancing towards the Punjab from the Siwalik hills. On the way he heard that some of the *amirs* of the Lord of the Conjunctions had said that it was proper that Sultān Sikandar should bring a thousand horses as his tribute. The Sultān became distressed in his mind on hearing this news and turned back and sent a petition that as a tribute fit for the offering had not been got together his departure has been postponed for a few days. His Majesty on becoming aware of the circumstances reprimanded the men who had said that Sultān Sikandar should present a thousand horses as a tribute and having shown favour to the emissaries of Sultān Sikandar told them that the *amirs* had made an altogether unreasonable demand and the Sultan should come and wait upon His Majesty without any anxiety. When the Sultan heard this news from the ambassadors he came out of Kashmir with great pleasure with the determination to wait on His Majesty but when he passed Baramula he heard that His Majesty the Lord of the Conjunctions had crossed the river Sind and had proceeded towards Samargand. He then sent his ambassadors with much tribute to wait upon His Majesty and turned back towards Kashmir.

And as he was extremely liberal the learned men of Iraq and Khurasan and Mawara un nahr came with hopeful faces to his thresh old and the Islamic religion became prevalent in Kashmir.

Verses

His noble spirit such generosity proclaimed
That even to the hopeless despair forbidden became
When Islam such resplendence gained
His door the sacred shrine of high and low became

Among the learned men he showed very great honour to ¹ Sayyid Muhammad who was the chief of the wise men (of the age) and

¹ It is not quite clear who this man was. Was he Mir Muhammad the son of Sayyid Ali Hamadani who led a batch of five hundred Sayyids into

made complete arrangement for breaking images and pulling down the temples of the *Kāfis*. Among the temples there was a great one at ¹ Bahārāh, which was dedicated to Mahādēv. The Sultān had it demolished. Although they dug under it, and went down up to the water, they could not find its end. They also pulled down another temple which was at ² Jakdar, and (when they did so) great flames burst out, which the Sultān (himself) saw. (It is said that) ³ Rājā Lalitādat Devharāh had built it outside the sacred city

Kashmir in 1381, following his father who had led seven hundred the year before after the expulsion of the Sayyids by Timur? (See note 2, p. 432 of *Tārīkh-i-Rashidī* by Elias & Denison Ross)

¹ The MSS have بحرارة Bahrārāh, and بحرارة Bajwārāh, and the lith ed has رارة without any dots so that they may be many different names. Firishtah lith ed has باع بحر آرا and Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 465) has Punjhuzara. There is a great deal in Jonarāja about the breaking of images, but I have not been able to find any mention of the demolition of the temples.

² The MSS have حكدار Jakdar and the lith ed has حكت Jakat. Firishtah lith ed has اورا كه حكدیو بود which Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 465) has translated, "the temple dedicated to Jug Dew". According to the *Āin-i-Akbarī* (Jarrat, vol II, p. 364, note 3), this temple was at Parihāsapura, pronounced by the Kashmiris as Poruspūr. It was the ancient Parihāsapura which was built by Lalitāditya who reigned A.D. 723-760. It was, writes General Cunningham, situated on the river bank of the Jhelum near the present village of Sumbal. The Cambridge History of India does not give the name of the temple. سن پور Sanpūr is the name of the place in the text edition.

³ The name is written as الملكاداد and الملك in the MS and الملكاد in the lith ed. Firishtah also has الملكاد. Col Briggs has "Raja Bulnat", and Mr Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p. 101) has Lalitāwat. The king referred to may be Lalitāditya Muktāpīda, who according to the Chinese Annals of the T'ang Dynasty sent an embassy to China in the reign of the Huen Tsiang, A.D. 713-755. He did not live 1,100 years before the Iconoclast 1393-1450 A.D. but his name is the nearest I can get to Lalitāwat. Firishtah lith ed in the corresponding passage has راجه الملكاد بدس ار ظهور اسلام دیو نره در عایت عظمت و استحکام در ترس نور ساخته بود. This does not throw much light on the matter except for the similarities of the name of the Rājā to that of Lalitāditya. The name Taraspūr is apparently a mistake for Paraspūr or Parihāsapura (see end of the preceding note).

of Durapur and had learnt from astrologers that after one thousand and one hundred years a *Badshah* of the name of Sikandar would demolish it and would break up the image of Mercury which was in it. This matter he had caused to be engraved on a plate of copper which he had put into a casket and had caused it to be buried under the edifice. At the time of demolishing it the inscription was discovered. The Sultan said: Would that they had left this inscription on the face of the building so that I should not have issued the order for its demolition. ¹ All spirituous liquors and duties were entirely abolished in his kingdom.

In his old age he suffered from a burning fever. He sent for Mirin Khan, Shahi Khan and Muhammad Khan who were his three sons and gave them testamentary directions. He conferred the title of Ali Shah on Mirin Khan and bestowed the kingdom on him.

The period of his rule was twenty two years and nine months and six days.

¹ The MSS. have *سراب و بے ما*. The lith. ed. has *وسراب قطعاً* which is incorrect. Firishlah lith. ed. has *وارولاب اور اوار عکس حوالہ کار و حوالہ مسلمانی*. It was natural that as zealous not to say a bigoted Muslim Sultan Sikandar should have gone in for a dry Kashmir but his reason for the abolition of the *Tamagha* cannot be so easily understood nor the exact nature of the tax which he abolished. Col Briggs translates *Tamagha* a export duty. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the prohibition of the use of spirituous liquor or the abolition of the *Tamagha*. Rodgers (*J I S B* vol. LIV p. 10-) mentions that Sikandar prohibited the use of wine but says nothing of the abolition of the *Tamagha*. The word as I have said elsewhere means a stand or a seat and I suppose it came to mean a tax because the payment of tax was denoted by the affixing of a stamp.

The names of the sons are as I have them in the text in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. Firishlah lith. ed. has Mir Khan as the name of the eldest but the names of the other two are as in the *Tabaqat*. Col Briggs (vol. IV p. 466) has Ameer Khan and Slady Khan as the names of the two elder sons. The Cambridge History of India page 80 has Nur Khan as the name of the eldest and Shahi Khan of the second. Jonaraja line 284 gives the names *मेरखान* and *सिखान* and they are described as *प्रत्यक्षा द्वय धर्माधिकारि कान्मनारमा* and their mother is called *सरदेवी* (l. 285) so Mir Khan of Firishlah appears to be correct. He appears to have had another son called *पिदज* Firuja or Firuz by another queen Sobha Devi (l. 286).

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN 'ALĪ SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR
BUTSHIKAN, WHO HAD THE NAME OF MĪRĀN KHĀN

In spite of the fact that he was young,² his greatness and an awe of him having found place in men's hearts, the people of the country were obedient to him. In the early years he left the management of affairs to ³ Sīyah Bhat, who having become a Musalmān had been the *vazīr* of Sultān Sikandar. During the period of four years in which he was the *vazīr*, he perpetrated various kinds of oppressions and tyranny on the people. Most of the Hindūs left the country and some killed themselves. When Sīyah Bhat died of a ⁴ hectic fever, the Sultān selected his younger brother Shāhī Khān, who was famous for his bravery and intelligence, for the post of *vazīr*, and the latter took charge of all affairs. After that the Sultān made ⁵ Shāhī Khān his *locum tenens* and directing his ⁶ younger brother Muhammad Khān to obey him, left Kashmīr with the object of ⁷ travelling about, and went to the Rāja of Jammū, who was his father-in-law.

¹ The headings are slightly different in the MSS and in the lith ed. One MS omits the word *Butshikan*. The lith ed inserts the word گومت before the name of Sultān 'Alī Shāh. One MS omits the که before Mīrān Khān. The lith ed substitutes او و for که. In the text edition the heading ends with سکندر . . . سکی.

² According to Firishtah the grandeur was of Sultān Sikandar, and the awe was felt for him, and not for the young prince.

³ The name is سہ بہت and ستہ بہت in the MS and سہ بہت in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has سہ بہت. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 467) has Seeva Dew Bhut. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 103) has Syah But, and the Cambridge History of India, page 280, has Sinha Bhat.

⁴ In the text edition he is stated to have died of مری دی or tuberculosis.

⁵ One MS rather unnecessarily and tautologically inserts که شہادت موسوم بود.

⁶ One MS has برادر آورد تر را.

⁷ The MSS as well as the lith ed have برسر راحہ حمو کہ. Firishtah explains further by saying that he went to the Rāja of Jammū to bid him farewell برای وداع. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 467) has "of travelling in foreign countries". In all these there is no mention of a pilgrimage, but the *Āin-e-Akbarī*, Jarrat, vol II, page 387, says that 'Alī Shāh set out for Hijāz, and Haig (*J R A S*, vol L, 1918, p 455) says he "resolved to perform the pilgrimage to Makkah", and the Cambridge History of India,

At this time some interested persons made him repentant of his having made Shahi Khan his successor. The Rijas of Jammu and Rajauri having gone to support 'Ali Shah he again brought Kashmir into his possession. Shahi Khan retired from Kashmir to Sialkot. During this time Jasrat Khokhar who had been seized by the Lord of the Conjunctions (Timur) but after His Majesty's death had fled

page 80 says desired in an access of religious zeal to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. Jonaraja also supports this for although Mecca or Hijaz is not specifically mentioned the anxiety of 'Ali Shah for तीर्थानुसरण and तीर्थयात्रासुखकाम are mentioned in lines 693 and 699 and in line 711: and निवस्यन्ति जल्पन स तीर्थाय धरणीपति । युवराज इटाद्राज्यमारुमयादयधिरात । His enthusiasm for pilgrimage however appears to have been very short lived for it appears from line 705 that the privations and the probable small result of the pilgrimage soon removed all his enthusiasm for it and the king of Madra (Jammu) took him back to Kashmir (l. 10). The new king Shahi Khan was displeased at his brother's return and followed by the *plakurs* he went away from Kashmir (l. 14). Then we come to Jasrat called Jasratha by Jonaraja (l. 730). And in line 734 we read of the march of 'Ali Shah against Jasrat but it is said that his enterprise was censured by his army which was astonished at his own poverty. Afterwards when he came to a place called Mudgaravyala (l. 738) a messenger came from the Raja of Madra telling him not to begin the war with the Khokhars although there were great warriors in his army as he (the Madraraja) alone knew the खड्गबाणव्यूहम्. Then 'Ali Shah was defeated. There is no mention however of *Kabandla* or headless bodies. *Zaim ul Uddin* (जैमोक्षामदीन) entered first the hearts of the inhabitants and then the capital पौराण्य प्राक मन पद्माद्राजधानी टपोविषय (l. 751).

As to the general history of 'Ali Shah's reign Firishlah agrees generally with the Tabaqat but he says that the Raja of Jammu and Rajauri reproved 'Ali Shah about his making Shahi Khan his heir and he repented of what he had done and they sent troops with him to attack Shahi Khan. The latter went to Sialkot and sought the help of Jasrat Shaukha Khokhar. Then there was a battle. There is no mention of any headless body. 'Ali Shah was defeated as his troops were fatigued after the long rapid march and the enemy did not give them any time to rest and recover. As to 'Ali Shah Firishlah says that according to one account he fell alive in Jasrat's hands and according to another Shahi Khan pursued him and drove him out of the kingdom.

The Cambridge History of India page 280 adds nothing new but according to it the final battle took place near the Tattakuti pass. I have not been able to find anything about this pass. There is a Tatakuti pass which is almost due east to the entrance of the Lohara Valley but it cannot be identified with the Tattakuti pass.

from Samatqand, coming to the Punjāb had acquired great power Shāhī Khān joined ¹ Jasiat Khōkhar and having obtained reinforcements from him, brought them to attack 'Alī Shāh. The latter advanced against Jasiat with an immense army, and a great battle took place and many were killed on both sides. They say that certain headless bodies had risen up and had moved about in the battlefield. It is a fixed belief among the Indians, that in any battle, in which ten thousand are slain, a headless body, which is called the *Kabandh* in ² Hindī, rises and moves about. In the end 'Alī Shāh having no strength (to continue the fight) fled, and Shāhī Khān entered Kashmīr in pursuit of him. The men in the city rejoiced at his coming.

The period of the rule of 'Alī Shāh was six years and nine months.

³ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN ZAIN-UL-'ĀBIDĪN, SON OF SULTĀN SIKANDAR BUTSHIKAN, WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR SHĀHĪ KHĀN

Sultān Zam-ul-'ābidīn, after his brother sought a place on the throne of the empire. ⁴ Jasiat Khōkhar aided by the Sultān's power brought the whole of the Punjāb into his possession, although he could not conquer Dehlī. Tibet and the whole country which is situated on the bank of the river Sind came into the Sultān's possession. ⁵ He made Muhammad Khān, his younger brother, a councillor and left the decision of all affairs to his judgement. He himself took great pains for ascertaining the truth in all cases and disputes. He cultivated the society of all classes. He had acquired much learning and skill in arts, and in his assemblies men of intellect, both Hindūs

¹ سرنه ~ in the text edition here is apparently a misprint for رب ~

² One MS. has هندی and the other has هندی. The lith. ed. has neither the one nor the other. كنده Kāndah in the text edition.

³ The name of Zam-ul-'ābidīn appears to have been too much for the writers of the MSS. One calls him Sultān Zam-ud-dīn, and the other Sultān Al-'ābidīn. The lith. ed. has the name correctly, but it inserts the words ذکر حکومت before Sultān Zam-ul-'ābidīn.

⁴ The relation between Sultān Zam-ul-'ābidīn and Jasiat is somewhat differently expressed by Jonarāja (l. 760), वसन्त इव कामस्य भूपतेरभवत् सदा । छु छुराधिपतिस्तस्य हत्येष्वभ्यधिकप्रिय ।

⁵ This is rather finely described by Jonarāja, who says

भोगे सखा नये मन्त्री विवेक्ता शास्त्रनिर्णये । श्रीमद्विद्वानोभूत् कश्मीरेन्द्रस्य सोदर ।

(l. 758)

and Muslims were always present. In the science and art of music he had very great skill. No other ruler of Kashmir had the success which he had in settling and increasing the population, in expanding the cultivation and in excavating canals and water courses.

Couplet

To every one does not come that with the cloud of his resolution
He can keep the young plants of his time verdant and green.

Wherever a robbery took place in his kingdom there was a mulct or fine fixed from the chief men of that village and for this reason robberies and thefts became completely unknown. In his time the writing of the rates of the prices of different commodities was ordered. These were engraved on thin copper plates and were left in all cities¹ to indicate that all customs of tyranny had been rooted out in the kingdom of Kashmir and (to point out) - that whoever came after him and did not act according to his practices God and he would know (the effect of such conduct).

On the prayer of² Sri Bhat who in the science of medicine was unrivalled in the age and had received various kinds of favours from

¹ This is the translation of the passage as it is found in the MSS and in the lith ed. but it is not at all clear how the fixing of the prices of commodities would remove all tyrannical customs. It appears to me that some words have been omitted here. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has in addition to the fixing of prices about which however the meaning of what Firishtah says is not at all clear for what he says about it is *و برح نویسی که در زمان او سده بود* و *در عهد سلطان سابق نبود دور کرد*. I cannot make out the meaning of the last two words. However Firishtah goes on to say *و مصاد و مواظ خود را بر* *و محکمات مس کدد و در هر شهری و دهی گداسب با رسوم ظلم از ولایت کسبتر بر افشاد*. This has some meaning but even the leaving of the rules and regulations of government engraved on copper plates in every city and village would hardly be sufficient to eradicate all customs of tyranny and oppression.

This somewhat cryptic adjuration to his successors is thus expressed by Firishtah *گویند بر محکمات مس نویسه بود که هر که بناد و بدین دستور کار کند بلمب خدا گردبار باد*.

² The name is *سری ب* in the MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah and *سری* in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat*. The name does not appear to be mentioned by Col Briggs or in the Cambridge History of India. Rodgers (*JASB* vol LIV p 103) calls him Sri Bihut. His correct name according to Jonaraja (1893) was *शिवभट्ट* Śiva Bhatta.

the Sultān, other Brahmans, who during the reign of Sultān Sikandar had, on the accusation of Siyah Bhat been banished, came back and took up their quarters in the temples, and places which had been allotted to them, and stipends were granted to them. The Sultān took an agreement from Brahmans, that they would not ¹act in contravention of what was written in their books. After that he revived all their customs, such as the making of sectarian march, and ²the burning of women with their (dead) husbands, etc., which Sultān Sikandar had abolished.

He also excused the *ra'iyats* from paying all fines ³ and tributes, and all payments of grain (*i.e.*, in kind). He issued an order that merchants bringing commodities from different directions should not hide them, and refraining from all wicked storing (cornering?) should sell them at a small profit. He released all persons who had been imprisoned in previous reigns. ⁴ He allowed the treasures of all countries, which were conquered, to be plundered, and assessed the revenue on them on the same scale as that of (the country round) the capital. He chastised the turbulent people, and kept a watch over them according to the necessary standard.

He showed favour to *faqīrs* and the aged and helpless, and did not permit that they should perish. He never looked at the face of a strange woman or at another's wealth with an avaricious and dishonest eye. In kindness to the *ra'iyats*, he increased the length of the ⁵ yard

¹ Both MSS have نقل نکند. The lith. ed. has فعل نکند. The meaning of course as Frishtah has it تحلف نہ، اید. I do not know that نقل نکردن conveys this meaning, فعل نکردن may do so, but عمل کردن is better. I have, however, retained فعل نکند. In the text edition it is نقل نکند.

² In this matter Sultān Sikandar was very much ahead of his time. Neither Akbar nor any other emperor ordered this and it was not till Lord William Bentinck's time that the practice of *Sati* was abolished.

³ This is too vague. All fines were not abolished. As we have seen, the Sultān established one for putting down thefts and robberies. Frishtah is a little more definite. According to him بیسکس و حرمات و دیگر مصادرات کہ شہداران ار رعایای گرفتند بر اداحت. Even this is not precise, but if Frishtah is correct, it was the fines, etc., imposed by the provincial governors which were abolished.

⁴ The meaning of this is obscure. Frishtah makes it clear by saying کہ ابرا بر ساگر، موت می نمود, that is, he distributed it among the troops.

⁵ Only حریب in the text-edition.

measure and of the chain beyond what had been customary. The necessary amounts for the Sultān's household expenditure were provided for from the produce of the copper mines which had been discovered and where miners were always working. As in the time of Sultān Sikandar images of gold silver copper and other metal had been melted down and the metal had been coined and there was depreciation of those coins an order was passed that coins should be struck of pure copper that was produced from the mines and should be made current.

The Sultān was so pleasant and affable in his ways that when he was annoyed with anyone and exiled him from his kingdom he did it in such a way that a man did not know for what reason the Sultān had become annoyed with him and it was the same in the case of anyone ¹ who was the subject of a bad augury. People lived in his reign in anyway and followed any religion that they wished. Most of the Brahmans who had become Muslims in the reign of Sultān Sikandar apostatized again and none of the (Muslimans) learned men had any power or hold over them. ² He brought a canal near the Maran hill and founded a city there the populated portion of which extended over five *larohs*. He also founded other cities and settling learned and wise men and also poor men in them was always careful to enquire about their condition. He did not try to hoard treasure but in fact whatever came into his hand was spent on useful objects.

Couplet

As the cash of life thou canst not keep

Why over other cash shouldst thou keep guard

¹ The words are *و در باب هر که بغاوت بد برآمد همچو دل* the meaning of which is not at all clear. In the text edition *بغاول بد می راند* is a better reading.

I have not been able to identify the Maran hill. Firishtah also has *کوه ماران* but Col Briggs does not appear to mention it. Rodgers (*J I S B* vol LIV p 103) refers to this where he says 'The king brought a canal from the mountain and built a city five foss in circumference'. The Cambridge History of India page 81 says 'he founded a city bridged rivers restored temples and conveyed water for the irrigation of the land' but neither it nor Rodgers makes any attempt to identify the locality. Jonaraja mentions Mandaragiri (l 858) as a locality where he made the waters which had hitherto been useless useful and fruitful and Nandaśaila (l 860) as a hill from which he brought down a canal but I have not been able to find out anything more about these places.

And in his time, a man of the name of Sultān Muḥammad was born, who was both a poet and a wise man. He could compose extempore verses in any form and meter he wished. He also immediately and without any consideration solved any literary difficulty that was propounded to him. The Sultān showed honour to the learned men of Islām and said, "They are my preceptors." He also showed honour to Yogīs on account of their poverty and austerity, and he did not look at the defects of any community. As he had great intelligence he immediately solved every difficult problem, in the solution of which other men were unsuccessful. Among such problems (there was the case of) a woman who had a grudge against one of her servants, and having killed one of her own children threw the body into the servant's house. Early the next morning, when the accusation fell upon the latter she went to the Sultān praying for justice. The *vazīrs*, after much enquiry, confessed their inability to find out the truth of the matter. The Sultān himself turned his attention to its decision. He first of all summoned the servant, who had been accused, to his private chamber, and there threatened her in various ways, and left no stone unturned in the matter. As the woman was innocent of the act she made no confession of any kind. At last the Sultān said, "If you become naked, and in the presence of men go to your own house, that might be a proof of your innocence." The woman cast her head down in shame, and said, "For me it is better to die than to act in this way. I consent to my punishment, but I cannot consent to behave in this way."

The Sultān then withdrew his hand from her, and sending for the other woman, who was making the accusation, said, "If you are honest in making this complaint make yourself naked in the presence of men." The woman ¹ without any hesitation wanted to become naked. The Sultān told her not to do so, and said, "The ² guilt of this act is yours, you made a false accusation against your servant," and after they had struck her a few strokes, she confessed her guilt.

¹ The reading in one MS. and in the lith. ed. is as I have it in the text, except that the last word in the lith. ed. is *شود* and not *شدن*.

² Both MSS. and the lith. ed. say that *حرم این کار اوست*. I think the first word should be *محرم*. In the text edition *حرم* is retained.

The Sultān did not direct thieves and robbers to be executed but he ordered that they should work every day with chains on their feet on public buildings and should be supplied with their food. He also forbade all hunting so that animals might not be killed. He did not eat any meat in the month of Rāmādan and owing to his munificence many performers of vocal and instrumental music came from various places to Kashmir. Among these was Mulla Ūdī who was one of the ¹ poor pupils of Khwajah Abd ul qadir and came from Khurasan. He played on the Ūd (some instrument like a lute or a harp or a lyre) in such a way that it was a source of great pleasure to the Sultan and he was exalted with various favours. Mulla Jamil Hafiz who was unrivalled in versification as also in elocution also received great favours from the Sultan. His drawings (*naqshhas*) are celebrated to this day in Kashmir and ³ Habib a maker of fire works or of guns who (first) manufactured muskets in Kashmir lived in his reign and had no rival in his art. The Sultan in concert with him wrote a book containing questions and answers this work is of very great value. There were many dancers ⁴ rope dancers and *natuaks* (actors ²) in his time. There had also been men in Kashmir who sang one tune in twelve different modes or variations.

At certain times when the Sultān wished to be gay and cheerful he ordered that ⁵ *Rubabs* and *Bins* and other musical instruments

¹ The words in the MSS and in the lith ed are *که ار ساگرد ان بواسطه*. One of the meanings of *بواسطه* in the dictionary is without means. Firishtah in the corresponding passage omits the word *بواسطه*.

Rodgers (p 104) translates this sentence as his name is a proverb in Kashmir for excellence in poetry. The word about which I am doubtful is *naqsh* which ordinarily means a drawing. I wonder whether it means a tune here. The word occurs again a few lines further down where one *naqsh* is said to have been rendered in twelve modes or forms.

³ The name is written as ~ Habib in both MSS and as *حلب* Halb in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has *حب* Jab and Rodgers also has Jab.

⁴ The word is *رسمان ناران* in the Tabaqat and *طناب ناران* in the lith ed of Firishtah. Rodgers has acrobats. The next word is *نروها* in one MS and *نروا* in the other and *نروها* in the lith ed. There is no corresponding word in Firishtah and I cannot find *نرو* or *نرو* in the dictionary. It may be that *نرو* or *نرو* is a corruption of the Sanskrit *नट* an actor.

⁵ A *Rubab* is a four stringed instrument in the form of a shortnecked guitar but having a surface of parchment instead of wood. I cannot find *بن* bin

in the dictionary but the name is a form of Sanskrit *Vīṇā* also a stunged instrument *Frishtah* has *تانبہ* *Tanbā* instead which is a kind of lute or guitar with a long neck. Rodgers does not mention any of these instruments.

² One MS and the lith ed have علم but the other has علم

⁴ The name of the book is بانک Bānak in one MS and the lith ed, and مانک, which may be Mābak or Mānik or Māyak as there is no dot above or below the third letter, in the other MS. Firishtah lith ed has something different, viz, و بودی بت که شاعرائے فردوسی تمام ناد دانستی زن نام کتانی در عام موسیقی تمام so that according to him it was not Sahūm but Būdī But (Buddhi Bhatta ?) who wrote the treatises on music, and it was called Zam and not Mānik. مامک Māmik has been adopted in the text edition.

acquainted with Persian Indian Tibetian and other languages and many books in the Arabic and Persian languages were translated by his orders into the *Hindi* language and the ¹ *Mahabharat* which is a most famous book and the book called *Riyatarangini* which is the name of a history of the *Bilshahs* of Kashmir were translated into Persian by his order

The pardoned (late) Sultan Abu Said sent Arab horses and Bactrian camels from Khurasan as presents to the Sultan. The latter was highly pleased at this and in reply sent donkeyloads of saffron paper musk shawls and cups of glass or crystal and other wonderful products of Kashmir for the acceptance of the *Khaqan* (sovereign) who has since attained to Divine mercy. Sultan Bahlul Lodi and Sultan Mahmud Cuyuti sent the finest things of their respective kingdom and strengthened the relations of affection. The rulers of Mecca the revered and of Egypt and Cilicia and other countries also sent fine and beautiful presents and maintained similar relations. The *Bilshah* of Sind sent many equipments and other ²things ³with one of his servants with an ode in praise of the Sultan. The latter was highly pleased on reading the ode. When Durgar Sen the Raja of Cwalur came to know the Sultan's great love for the science of music and singing he sent two or three valuable treatises

on these sciences, and his son Rāja ¹ Gōp Singh also after him kept the relations of sincerity and attachment intact. The Rāja of Tibet got hold of ² two wonderful animals of an elegant shape, which are called *Hans* in the language of the people of India, from the place called Mānsarwar, the water of which is subject to no change, and sent them to the Sultān. The latter was exceedingly pleased on seeing them. Among their other characteristics one was, that when milk mixed with water was placed before them, they separated the milk from water with their beaks and drank it and pure water was left behind.

The Sultān, in the beginning of his reign, made Muhammad, his brother, his successor, and left all affairs in his charge. After his death he confided in his son Haider in his place, and left all affairs in his charge. He also distinguished his two foster brothers, named Mas'ūd and ³ Shēr, by great proximity to his person, but in the end they fell out, and Shēr killed Mas'ūd, who was his younger brother, and in retaliation the Sultān had him executed.

The Sultān had ⁴ three sons, one, Ādam Khān, who was the eldest, but who always appeared wretched in the eyes of the Sultān, and Hājī Khān, and Bahrām Khān, he was the youngest of all, but had an extensive *jāgīr*. And he conferred the title of ⁵ Daryā Khān on a

¹ The name is differently written. One MS has کوب بند while the other has کوب بندہ, and the lith ed has کوب بندہ. The name can, I think, be only Gōp Singh or Kōb Sing. In the text edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted کوب س.

² Firishtah says the animals were called *vāghans* by the people of India, and the place, where they were obtained, was the *haud* called *Sarwar* and not *mauda* called Mānsarwar.

³ One MS calls the elder foster brother ماسیر Masēr by mistake, while further down it calls him شہر Shēr.

⁴ According to Jonarāja he had four sons by the daughter of the king of Madra, named respectively آزاد خان, حیو خان, جسر خان and بھر خان (lines 855 and 856), of whom only the 1st, 2nd and 4th are named in the Persian histories. In the *Rājataranginī* of Śrīvara (1st taranga, line 56) he is said, however, to have had only three sons, whose names are somewhat differently written, viz, آزاد خان, حیو خان and بھر خان.

⁵ The MSS have اوریا, and دریا instead of داریا. The lith ed and the lith ed of Firishtah have ملا دریا Mullā Daryā.

man of unknown descent called Mulla Darya and placed him in charge of all affairs and occupied himself with pleasure and enjoyment

¹ When Sri Bhat who was the *ra ir* departed from the world the Sultān dedicated in memory of him one *kror* of the gold of Kashmir which is equivalent to four hundred *ashrafis* or gold mohurs to his sons

The Sultān was an adept in the (occult) sciences of the *Yogis* and men had seen ² his spirit leaving his body which is called ³ *Simiya*

¹ Shiva Bhatta see note 3 page 63 I have translated this passage as it is found in the MSS and in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has however a different version and Col Briggs another while Mr Rodgers has a third and from it draws an inference which does not appear to be quite justified The passage is not well connected with the context and it is therefore difficult to judge whether Nizam ud din's or Firishtah's version is more likely to be correct In the Tabaqat it occurs just after the mention of the Sultān's son but there can be no doubt that the man who died and for the good of whose soul the money was paid was Sri Bhat or Shiva Bhatta the *ra ir* In Firishtah also the passage occurs immediately after the mention of the Sultān's sons but here the person for the good of whose soul the gift is made is *سردو کوک* or *سردو کوک* i.e. the Sultān's foster brother Shērud or Shērdō though earlier he had been called *Sl r* The foster brothers and their mutual quarrel and the execution of one of them had been mentioned by Nizam ud din and Firishtah before the mention of the Sultān's son Then the amount of the gift is *ری کہ چار صد اسری باند* Col Briggs (vol IV pp 40-471) calls the foster brother Shērud and the amount 400 *seer* of silver gold Rodgers (J.S.B. vol I IV p 10) follows Firishtah and makes the amount a *kror* i.e. of gold 400 camel load I think Firishtah is right as to the person for the good of whose soul the gift was made for the *ra ir* had not done anything for which his soul would require such a heavy ransom As to the amount of the gift it would be useless to enter into any calculations without knowing even approximately the weight or the value of the *ra* Rodgers's assumption is that the Sultān was extremely rich and a sum of four hundred gold pieces would not be too high a sum for his gift for the salvation of his foster brother's soul Four hundred camel loads of gold would of course be another matter

The words are *صلح بدن* in the lith ed and *صلح بدن* in one MS In the other MS they are rather indistinct The other word which is apparently the name given to it in the language of *Yogis* is written as *سمنا* and *سمنا* in the MS and *هما* in the lith ed The same word occurs again where it is called *علم سمنا* in one MS *سمنا* in the other and *علم سمنا* in the lith ed The word is not to be found in Firishtah where however the *Yogi* is said to have said that he knew a science by which he could take the Sultān's illness on him self so that the Sultān would recover completely

³ See the preceding note

They say that on one occasion the Sultān became so ill that he was about to die, and people washed their hands (i.e., despaired) of his recovery. At this time a Yogī appeared in Kashmīr, and said "I know the science of ¹the transmigration of life, and excepting that there is no other treatment for the Sultān, who has contracted an extremely severe disease. The treatment is that I should separate my soul (or life) from my body, and should put it into the Sultān's body." The Sultān's attendants, considering this a great boon, took the Yogī with one disciple of his to the bedside of the Sultān, and left them there by ²themselves. The Yogī bringing out his soul out of his body, by a ³science, which he knew, put it into the Sultān's body after the latter's soul or life had become separated (from his body). He had previously instructed his disciple, to take his body, which would become lifeless, to the ⁴Āsan, which is the name of the dwelling-place of Yogīs, and to ⁵guard it. When the disciple came out, carrying the body of the Yogī, the Sultān's attendants hastened to the latter's side, and found him healthy in body, and they rejoiced exceedingly.

After some time ⁶the sons of the Sultān becoming hostile to one another rose in conflict among themselves. Ādam Khān, who was the

¹ See note 2, page 661

² One MS has *نہاں* concealed, instead of *نہا* alone or here by themselves

³ One MS has *نہ عملی*, the other MS and the lith. ed. have *نہ عملی*. I prefer the first reading

⁴ The word is *آس* in both the MSS and in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. I wonder, however, whether it is not a mistake for *آسوم*

⁵ *Firishtah* has something of an anti-climax, where he says *اراسب سگ* and guard it from injury by dogs, cats and other animals. *Firishtah* also tries to explain the *Yogī's* power and says that the *Yogīs* by their mental exercises probably acquire such powers, and gives instances of similar cures effected by descendants of His Holiness Khwājah Muhammad Husam Pārsā, and says that the two cases may probably be placed in the same category but ends with the pious ejaculation of *والله اعلم بالصواب* God knows the best.

⁶ It appears that they were misled by evil advices. See lines 60-64 of Srīvara's *Rājataranginī* (canto I). It also appears that the Zam ul-ābidīn being afraid of some catastrophe (अथाभयं नृप ५१५) sent Ādam Khān towards little Tibet (सुदनागैण) (l. 71).

eldest left Kashmir and with a great army invaded the country of (little) Tibet. He conquered the whole of that country and brought an immense quantity of booty to the Sultan and became the recipient of favours. ¹ Haji Khan under the Sultan's orders marched to attack Loharkot. Owing to the intemperate behaviour of Haji Khan the Sultan always kept Ādam Khan near him. At last at the instigation of some of the people of Loharkot Haji Khan advanced towards Kashmir (i.e. the capital). Although the Sultan sent written and verbal messages to him that he should not come they had no effect. Having no other alternative the Sultan left the city with the intention of engaging him in battle and encamped in the plain of ² Pallāsila. Although Haji Khan repented of his conduct yet

¹ Line 83 says that when Ādam Khan returned after conquering the Bhuttas Haji Khan marched to the Lohara mountain (Lohkote according to Col Briggs vol IV p 471) by the Sultan's order and as the latter knew that two knives could not be placed in one sheath he ordered their coming and going. Śrīvara then describes the way in which Haji Khan's adherents incited him to return to Kashmir (lines 85-108) and in line 110 he says that the king quickly left the city with his army on hearing of his son's approach.

² The name of the place is written in the MS as ہل ہل Halhal and ہل Hal which may be anything and ہل Hal in the lith ed. Firsihtah lith ed has ہل Hal. In the text edition it is ہل Hal. Col Briggs (vol IV p 471) has Buleel and Rodgers has Pulpul. Śrīvara Pandit calls the place where the two armies met and whence the Sultan sent a Brahmin's ambassador to Haji Khan पल्लिसिलास्थान (l 117) but where that was I cannot find out except that if it was on the route between Srinagar and Loharkot it was somewhere to the east of the former place and probably near the Pir Panjal range. The ambassador's message and speech are also given at some length (lines 119-128) and ending with the threat 'Your commanders would be slain like sparrows!' Haji Khan's adherents were of course angry but he said that he would go and fall at his father's feet and whether he was pleased or angry he could do to him whatever he liked (line 132 *et seq*). His adherents however adjured him to go on with what he had begun. They said 'Let us fight if we are victorious you get the kingdom. If we die you die wait only till we fight if we are slain do as you think proper.' Hearing these words Haji Khan was sunk in a sea of thought (l 142). The Sultan on hearing what the ambassador had to say ordered his army to begin the battle. After the battle had gone on for the whole day Haji Khan turned back (l 164).

It appears however from the end of the first *taranga* of Śrīvara's poem that he calls it the मल्लिसिलायुद्धवर्णनम्. So the name of the battle field was

at the instigation of adventure-seeking men, he arrayed his army and marched to the field, and the battle went on from morning till evening. In the end, the army of Hājī Khān was defeated. Many deeds of bravery were performed by Ādam Khān in the battle. Hājī Khān fled towards ¹Hirpūr and Ādam Khān hastened in pursuit and tried to seize him, but the Sultān did not allow him to do so. Hājī Khān came from Hirpūr to ²Bhimbar and occupied himself with the treatment of the wounded. After the victory, the Sultān returned to Kashmīr and ordered ³the erection of a high minaret of the heads of his enemies and had the men belonging to Hājī Khān's army, who had been taken prisoners, put to death. He also inflicted great tortures on their families and descendants. On account of this most people separated from Hājī Khān and came to Ādam Khān.

Mallaśilā, but whether Pallaśilā and Mallaśilā are two places or whether Pallaśilā is a mistake for Mallaśilā or *vice versa*, I cannot make out.

¹ The name is written as *ناشير حود* and *نير حود* in the MSS and *نير پور* in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has *نير حود* and this has been adopted in the text-edition, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 472) has Heerpoor. Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India say Hājī Khān fled to Bhimbar, but according to the Tabaqāt and Firishtah he came to Bhimbar from the place mentioned in this passage. In Śrīvara, I, line 166, mention is made (apparently) of Ādam Khān's ferocity in the neighbourhood of Śūrapura. It appears that Hirpur (Hirpūr) or Huapor is the modern name of Śūrapura which is often described as the entrance station to Kashmīr. I think, therefore, I will not be far wrong in calling the place Hirpūr.

² The name is *نير* in one MS and *نير* in the other and *نير* in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt. *نير* is adopted by M Hidayat Hosain in the text edition. It looks like *نير* Banīr or Nābīr in the lith ed of Firishtah, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 472) has Nere. Rodgers has Bhimbar and so has the Cambridge History of India. Śrīvara in his *Rājataranginī* (1st *taranga*, l 169) says *चायखान सानुनापश्चिन्ने स्थिति यथात्*. I cannot find out where Citradeśa was.

³ As regards this, see Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī* 1st *taranga*, lines 171-174. It appears that *कायखान* or merciful Sultān was *दुखित*, and he was thoroughly dissatisfied with himself and his servants, it is not therefore likely that he should make a minaret of the heads of the slain who are described as the *सङ्ग्रामहतवीरेन्द्र*, though I cannot make out what the *सुखागार* was, that he made of the rows of the heads of the warriors who were killed in the battle. Was it a rest chamber, a sort of Valhalla? But even in that case the rows of heads would be a grisly decoration.

¹ After that Ādam Khān ruled (the country) with full authority for six years. Later on there was a terrible famine in the country of Kashmir so that a large number of men died of hunger. Owing to this the Sultan became very sorrowful and distributed most of the grain in the royal treasuries (granaries) among the people and reduced the land revenue in some places to one quarter and in others to one seventh (of the fixed amount). And ² Ādam Khān having acquired

¹ Firishtah says Ādam Khān was at this time declared to be the Sultan's successor and he ruled for six years. Col Briggs and Rodgers also say that he was made the heir to the throne. The Cambridge History of India does not say distinctly that he was declared to be the heir to the throne but it says that he participated for six years largely in the administration of the kingdom. Śrīvara (I l 18^o) says यौवराज्ये सुखं तद्बहुभुजे पश्य मम।

The famine is described at some length by Śrīvara. I lines 184-213 in fact the whole of the 2nd canto of the 1st *tarangī* which is called यद्भिन्नवर्षे दुर्मिषवर्षनम् is a description of the famine which occurred in the 6th year of the reign. He mentions the fact that the Sultan fed the people with his own paddy. He with the paddy in the royal granaries but he does not appear to mention the reduction of the various demands.

There were according to Śrīvara heavy rains and great floods after the famine though this is not mentioned by the Muslim historian. The heavy clouds frightened the people as enemies are frightened by showers of arrow (I l 217) and the *Itasta* (the Jhelum) the *Ledari* (the Lidar river) the *Sindhu* a tributary of the *Itasta* which flows into the latter at Prayag or the *Itasta Sindhu Sangama* a place of considerable sanctity and the *Isiptika* (the canal in Srinagar now the Kutakul) and other rivers submerged the villages on their banks as if in a terrible rivalry of one another (I l 221). According to the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* (Firis and Dennison Ro 3 p 3) flows from the Zoji pass down toward the Jhelum and was called the Lar. Stein does not give any modern name for it but says the two Sindus are distinguished by the Indus being called the Bud Sind. He also says that the valley of the other Sind forms the district of Lar. The merciful Sultan went round in a boat inspecting the damage caused by the rains and he greatly sympathized with the people in their privations (I lines 239-240). After that everyone was happy with a full harvest (I l 243).

² How he acquired the power is not quite clear. Firishtah does not give any information but he only says he acquired the power to plunder and ravage. دست بهاراج Col Briggs (vol IV p 47) says At this time he deputed Adhum Khan with a force to march and attack the fort of Gujraj which is not at all correct. Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 106) begins with In his government of Kamraj Ādam Khān was very oppressive but he does not say

power in the country of Kamīāj, committed ¹ various acts of oppression And ² many people came to the Sultān, and complained against him He refused to receive all *farmāns* which were sent by the Sultān, and finally collecting a large army marched to attack the Sultān, and ³ halted at Qutb-ud-dīnpūr The Sultān acting on the purport of the couplet,

Couplet

Attack not an army, larger than on your own,
For ⁴ on a lancet thou canst not strike thy fist

satisfied him by ⁵ various devices and sent him back to the country of Kamīāj, and ⁶ sent for Hājī Khān with great quickness

that the Sultān appointed Ādam Khān to that government The Cambridge History of India, page 283 says "After the famine Ādam Khān was entrusted with the government of the Kamīāj district" But it appears from I, line 273 of Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī* that his mind having become vitiated on account of his jealousy of his younger brother, he suddenly attacked the country, and from I, line 278, that one day being excited by the intoxication of being the Yuvarāja (heir to the kingdom) he went to the Kramarājya

¹ One MS omits by mistake the words from *و بساز مردم* to *مود*

² His and his followers' atrocious acts are described by Śrīvara in I, lines 280-290, and it is said in line 291 that when the king's messenger told his followers not to commit such oppression they replied, "Let the king if he is vexed, go on crying"

³ Śrīvara says in I, line 293 that having collected and equipped his forces at Kuddadenapura (Qutb ud dīnpūr) he came to attack the Sultān's forces at Jainanagara Firishtah also mentions Qutb-ud dīnpūr I cannot however find anything about its situation About Jainanagara or rather *J(Z)ainanagarī*, it appears from Jonarāja, line 871, that Zain ul 'ābidīn carried the canal called Jainagangā on which his new town Jainanagarī was built (see the notes on pp 111 and 112 of Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol I) as far as Ranavāmin This *J(Z)ainanagarī* was not far from the capital

⁴ The reading in the MSS which I have accepted is *ردن مست بر دستر*
The lith ed has *رد انگست بر دستر*

⁵ I cannot find out what these devices were Śrīvara (I, l 297) also has *सन्धुक्तिभिः*, i.e., by politic measures

⁶ Śrīvara mentions the sending of the letter to Hājī Khān in I, lines 299-300 The letter contained a rather piteous appeal *यत्र सत्प्राणसन्देहे गतिर्नान्या त्वया विना ।*

Ādam Khān on arriving in Kamraj advanced from there without any delay and attacked ¹Suyyapur. The governor of the place who had held that position from before the time of the Sultān came out and engaged him and was slain and the whole of the city was destroyed. The Sultān hearing this news sent a great army to attack Ādam Khān and there was ²a great battle. Many were killed in both the armies and Ādam Khān was defeated. When the bridge which had been erected at Suyyapur across the river Bihat (Vitasta or Jhelum) broke down ³about three hundred of the chief men on Ādam Khān's side were drowned as they were crossing the river in their flight.

Ādam Khān crossed the river and saw a place (for resting) on that bank. The Sultān came out of the capital and coming towards Suyyapur comforted the *raiyats*. At this time Hajī Khān in compliance with the *farman* which had been sent to him arrived by way of ⁴Punch to the vicinity of ⁵Baramulā. The Sultān sent his

¹ Suyyapura the modern S pur the chief place in *pariyana* /amagir which lie a short distance from the point where the *lata* leave the Wular Lake ر سر سونه adopted by M Hidwat Ho ain in the text

Both MSS have نام سهر ماتت رف but the lith ل ha نام سهر و لائب معادت رف I have omitted the word لائب

² Śrīvāra does not as far as I can make out mention the attack of Suyyapura by Ādam Khān and the latter's battle with the governor of the place but he mentions the battle between the Sultān and Ādam Khān armies (I lines 304-306)

³ This is also mentioned by Śrīvāra (I l 308)

⁴ The name of the place is سم and سم without any lit in the MSS. They cannot therefore be pronounced or translated with any certainty. In the lith ed it is بنجه Banjah and in the lith ed of Iri lit it is پنجه Punjab or Punjah and this has been followed in the text edition. Neither Col Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India mentions the place and I cannot find any place like Banja or Punja near Baramulā. In I line 3 Śrīvāra says that Hajī Khān arrived at this time at Purnotsa which (corresponding to the modern Punch or Prunts the Kashmiri form) seems to have been included in Lolāla and have been situated in the lower valley of the Thi (Tau) side Steins *Rajataranjini* vol II p 433. Punch is sufficiently like Punjab which is the name of the place in Firishtah. I have accepted Punch.

⁵ This agrees exactly with Śrīvāra (I l 303) Baramulā being called Varahamulā. The name is derived from the ancient Tirtha of Viṣṇu Ādi Varaha

youngest son Bahām to welcome him ¹ A great affection grew up between the two brothers. Ādam Khān fled from the place where he was, and went to the Nilāb (the Indus) by way of ² Shāhbang. The Sultān taking Hājī Khān with him returned to the capital, and made the latter his heir and successor. The latter girded up his loins in devotion to his father, and left no *minutiae* in his service unobserved. He recommended his own servants, who had been his companions and friends ³ during his travels in India, for all the high appointments in the government and obtained these for them from the Sultān, and allotted to them fine *jāgīrs*. The Sultān gave him a jewelled gold belt from the Sultān and was ⁴ always pleased with him.

(the bear incarnation of Viṣṇu) who was worshipped there evidently since early times (see Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol II, p. 182)

¹ Compare Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī*, I, line 321

² The name looks like شَاه مَنَك Shāh Mank and شَاه بِيَك Shāh Bik in the MSS and شَاه نِيَك Shāh Nīk in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has شَاهَزَاه Shāh-zah and Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 473) has Shahabad. In the text edition it is شَاه مَنَك. Rodgers says the Sultān with the aid of Hājī Khān drove Ādam Khān out of the valley, without mentioning the name of any place and the Cambridge History of India, page 283, says Ādam Khān "fled to the Indus". It appears from Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī*, I, line 326, that he शहिभङ्गपथा सिन्धु ससुतीर्य बलान्वित । प्राप सिन्धुपतेर्देशम्, i.e., crossing the Sindhu by way of Śāhibhanga arrived with his army in the country of the Lord of the Sindhu. It should be noted that the first Sindhu is not the Indus, but a tributary of the *Vitastā* and the second Sindhu is the Indus or the *Nīla*. The Śāhibhanga of Śrīvara appears to be identical with the large village of Shādīpūr which is opposite to the junction of the *Vitastā* and the *Sindhu*. Shādīpūr appears to be an abbreviation of Shihāb ud dīnpūr, but when and why it got the name of Shāhibband or Śāhibhanga is not clear.

³ There is some difference in the readings. One MS has کد ار سەر همد, کد ار سەر همد باد رفافت کردد بودد, while the other has کد ار سەر همد باد رفافت کردد بودد, while the lith ed has کد ار سەر و سەر باد رفافت کردد بودد. The readings in the MS are manifestly incorrect, but if the mistakes are corrected, they would mean, who were his companions and friends in his travels in India. The reading in the lith ed is more correct, but I cannot find any meaning of سەر و سەر.

⁴ Śrīvara describes at some length (I, lines 336-387) the various pleasant journeys of the Sultān and his son through the flower adorned country, with musical and other entertainments and calls the canto, which is the fourth in his first *taranga*, the पुष्पलीलावर्णन, i.e., the description of the flower

¹ At last Haji Khan contracted dysentery owing to constant drinking and there was great confusion in the government. The

carnival. Then he adds another (the fifth) canto (I lines 387-491) which he calls the क्रमसरोयाविवरण, in the course of which he describes the Sultan's visit to the Kramasaras now called the Kaonsar Nag a mountain lake two miles long situated at the foot of the highest of the three snowy peaks (1500 3 feet) and which is connected with the Indian deluge story and the peak to which Jagan in his fish aratara had bound the ship (nau) into which Durga had converted herself to save the seeds of the beans from destruction (see Stein's *Rajatarangini* vol II p 393). Then he has another canto (the sixth) which he calls the चित्रोपचयगल्पवर्णन which runs from line 490 to line 520. In this he first describes the excavation of the new lake called the Jainasaras near Padmapura now called Pimpur the chief place of the Vahu pargana and the erection of a palace on its bank and then describes the different presents sent to the Sultan by various princes and finally the advent of artists and artisans who introduced various beautiful kind of silk weaving. He next mentions the arrival of a राजधमर्षिभ्यः यवन a Yavana rupa dancer (l 508). After all this prosperity and advance came a period of adversity line 534 *et seq*. There was hail a comet made its appearance and continued to shine for two months then the dogs were always whining and there were eclipses of the sun and the moon both in the course of a fortnight. Then came the news (l 566) of the death of his nephew Śrī Kṛṣṇa mēna lord of Sindhu who was like a son to him and who was killed in battle by Lālā Ibrahim. Śrī Kṛṣṇa mēna may be Lakṣmīdīn and Ebbarāmā was certainly Ibrahim. But I have not been able to find out who they were. According to Śrīvara (I l 81) Zunūl Abidin was at this time remembering his departed friends servants and companions whom he loved like his own life he knew himself like an elephant who had gone astray from the herd (चतुर्तान् बन्धवान् भत्यान् सखीन् प्राणमत्तान् स्मरन्) स्वात्मानमविद्वद्वाजः यद्यद्यमिव द्विपमः)

1 Firishdah's account is somewhat different. He says the Sultan was displeased with Haji Khan on account of the latter's excessive drinking and his not listening to the Sultan's admonitions and the Sultan himself began to suffer from dysentery and as the Sultan was displeased with Haji Khan the work of government remained unattended to. Col Briggs (vol IV p 43) however agrees with the Tabaqat and says that Haji Khan and not the Sultan was seized with a bloody flux i.e. had an attack of dysentery. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India however follow Firishdah. The former says The king was seized with dysentery and the latter more vaguely the king fell sick. A reference to Srivara (I 1 58) shows distinctly that the Tabaqat and not Firishdah is correct. It is said there that राज्याधानस्य रक्तजम् । अस्त्रास्यगुदभूत्रित्य मद्यपानानिषेवनात् । The Sultan's admonitions are given in lines 58-59. In line 600 it is said that Haji Khan promised not to drink again.

¹ *amīns* secretly sent for Ādam Khān. He came according to their suggestion, and saw the Sultān. The latter was ² displeased at his coming, and was annoyed with the *amīns*. In the end the brothers mutually agreed, and Ādam Khān was honoured. After some time, the weakness of old age overwhelmed the Sultān, and ³ besides that he became ill. The ⁴ *amīns* and the *vazīns* all in concert submitted to him that if the duties of the government be entrusted to one of the Sultānzādas this would be the cause of peace and good government in the country. The ⁵ Sultān did not show any favour to this suggestion, and did not select any of his sons for the duties of the *sallanat*. Mischief-makers then intervened, and held various meetings. Bahrām Khān acting treacherously and speaking in a ⁶ mischief-making way made the two grown-up brothers hostile to each other. ⁷ Ādam Khān, becoming suspicious, went and took up his residence in Quṭb-ud-dīnpūr. When the Sultān became extremely feeble, the *amīns* ⁸ taking precautions against all disturbances did not allow his sons to come and enquire about his health, and sometimes they seated the Sultān with some trouble at an elevated spot, and had drums

except by his father's orders but going back to his own house he continued to drink (see l 603)

¹ See Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī*, I line 604 सन्निभ । आदमखानमानिन्युर्गूढलेखे-दिग्गन्तरात् ।

² There is a slight difference in the readings. One MS and the lith ed have ار آمدن او بد برد, while the other MS has ار آمدن او بد آمد. Firishtah in the corresponding passage says سلطان املا القاب باو می کرد. Śrīvara in I, line 606, says प्रवेशेस्य कृतोपेक्षो नृपोऽभवत् ।

³ The MSS as well as the lith ed have و بیماری علاوه ان گردید. This appears to me somewhat imperfect.

⁴ This is somewhat differently stated by Śrīvara in I, lines 626-27 तत्समच वधा येऽपि तत्सङ्गाद्वभाषिरे । राजनृत्वाद्यते देशे राज्यलुब्धे सुतेस्त्व । एकस्यैव निज राज्य किं नाप्यमि यो हित ।

⁵ Śrīvara in I, lines 630-33, says that the Sultān pointed out the bad qualities of his sons, and declared that he would not bestow the kingdom on any of them, but गते मयि बल यस्य स प्राप्नोत्विति मे मतम्, i.e., after my death let him who has the strength get it.

⁶ One MS has بقاء امیر but the other and the lith ed have بقاء

⁷ This is mentioned by Śrīvara in I, lines 685-689

⁸ One MS omits منه by mistake

beaten to inform the people that the Sultan had recovered. By this plan they managed to keep the country on its feet (*i.e.* safe from disturbances). At last when the Sultan's illness became very serious and he remained unconscious for a whole day and night one night ¹ Ādam Khan came alone from Qutb ud dinpur to see him and left his army outside the city so that it may keep watch on Hajī Khan and other enemies. On that night Hasan Kachhi who was one of the great *amirs* had taken the promise of allegiance to Hajī Khan from the *amirs* in the audience hall of the Sultan. On the following day the *amirs* got Ādam Khan out of Kashmir by some plan and summoned Hajī Khan with great promptitude. Hajī Khan came in compliance of the summons of the *amirs* and took possession of all the horses in the Sultan's stables and a large army collected round him but on account of apprehensions of disturbances and the treachery of his enemy ³ he did not go inside the palace.

When Ādam Khan heard this news he became frightened and retired to Hindustan by way of ⁴ Nawil. Many of his retainers

¹ Firishtah's account is slightly different. According to him Ādam Khan left his soldiers in the environs of the city and he himself passed the night in the audience chamber of the Sultan. Hasan Khan Kachhi also took the promise of allegiance to Hajī Khan from the *amirs* that same night in the audience chamber. The account of the behaviour of the three princes and of their movements which agrees generally with that in the text is given by Srivara I line 71 *et seq.* Hasan Kachi is described in line 74 as वसुनकापेश or Hasan the treasurer. He is also described as स्वयंभो सादयन परान २ deceiving others blinded by his selfishness. Ādam Khan is said to have gone to Qutb ud dinpur (I l 795).

² This is also mentioned by Srivara I line 798. I do not understand why so much importance was attached to the possession of the horses.

³ Srivara I line 731 says he was unable to go to see his father for fear of treachery although he was anxious to do so (सात्कारपि द्रोहः क्षया). Zain ul abidin died later द्वादश ज्यैष्ठमासस्य मध्याह्ने *i.e.* at midday on the 13th lunar day in the month of *Jyāishtha* (I l 744).

⁴ I cannot find anything about this place. It is written like مارول in one MS and مارول in the other and مارول in the lith. ed. Firishtah has Baramula the well known pass. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted مارول in the text edition.

separated from him ¹ Zain Badī, who was one of the trusted chiefs of Hājī Khān, hastened in pursuit of him. Ādam Khān fought bravely, and having slain many of his near relations escaped. Hasan Khān son of Hājī Khān, who was at ² Punch, came to his father, and the affairs of Hājī Khān were splendidly arranged.

The Sultān (i.e., Zain-ul-'ābidīn) passed away from the world

³ The period of his rule was 52 years

AN ACCOUNT OF ⁴ SULTĀN HAIDAR SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN
ZAIN-UL-'ĀBIDĪN, WHO HAD THE NAME OF HĀJĪ KHĀN

Three days after his father's (death) Hājī Khān took the latter's place and assumed the title of Sultān Haidar, and having ascended the throne in the manner of his father at ⁵ Sikandarpūr, which is

¹ I cannot find anything about him also. The name is written as *ابن بدر* in the MS. and *ایں بدر* in the lith. ed. Firishtah has *زین لارک* Zain Lārak. He is not mentioned by Col. Briggs or Rodgers or in the Cambridge History of India. In the text edition *زین بدر* has been adopted.

² See page 667, note 5. It will be seen there that the name of the place was Parnotsa. It will be seen also from Śrīvāra, I, line 607, that one of Hājī Khān's sons hearing of the arrival of his uncle (i.e., Ādam Khān), wishing to fight with him left the capital, and went to Parnotsa.

³ Nizām-ud dīn does not mention the date and year of Zain ul-'ābidīn's death. According to Firishtah he died at the end of 877 A.H., in his 69th year. Col. Briggs has 877 A.H., 1742 A.D. The last mentioned year is of course wrong, the figures having been transposed and 1472 being made into 1742. The Cambridge History of India, page 284, says Zain ul-'ābidīn died in November or December 1470. In this it follows Haig (*J R A S*, 1918, p. 456). Śrīvāra, I, line 744, says that the Sultān in *द्वादश ज्यैष्ठमासस्य मध्याह्ने जीवितं जहौ*. The month of *Jyāistha* corresponds with June, July and not with November or December. It appears also from Śrīvāra, II, line 4, that Hājī Khān assumed the sovereignty on the 1st day of the 2nd lunar fortnight of *Jyāistha*, (*ज्यैष्ठप्रतिपदिने*). It appears also, that, according to Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 107) the coins of Haidar bear the year 874 A.H., so we are as much in the dark as ever.

⁴ Śrīvāra in line 4 of the 2nd *tarāṅga* of his *Rājatarāṅgī* says *अथ हैदर-शाहाया व्यापयन्मुद्रिकार्षणे । द्वाज्यखानोऽग्रहीद्राज्यं स ज्यैष्ठप्रतिपदिने ।*

⁵ Neither Sikandarpūr nor Naushar appears to be mentioned in *Rājatarāṅgī*, but "Nau Shahr" is mentioned in the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, page 483, as being on the route by which Haidar Dughlat entered Kashmīr.

famous as ¹ Naushahr he gave away to deserving men the gold which was scattered over him His brother - Bahram Khan and his son Hasan khān placed the crown of the empire on his head and continued to serve him

Couplet

When death casts away the crown from one head
The sky (providence) places it on another's head

He allotted the country of ² Kamraj as the *jagir* of Hasan Khan and made him the *Amir ul umara* and his heir and successor He allotted ³ Nagam as the *jagir* of Bahram Khan He permitted the Rajas of the different districts who had come to offer condolence on the death of the late Sultān and congratulations to the new Sultān on his accession to return to their territories after bestowing on them horses and robes of honour He also bestowed on most of the *amirs* jewelled swords and robes

He had innate generosity but was always drunk and as he had a vindictive temperament most of the *amirs* being aggrieved with him went away to their *jagirs* As he was careless about the state of the kingdom the *raiyats* perpetrated various acts of oppression on the *raiyats* He distinguished a barber of the name of Boli by proximating him to his person and acted according to what he said to him The barber took bribes from men and turned the Sultān's disposition

¹ نوحه سهر in the text edition

² See line 7 of the 2nd *taranga* of the *Rajatarangini* of Srivara where it is said that his younger brother and his son standing before the Sultan were like *Sukra* and *Brhaspati* shining in front of the moon

³ The allotment of Kamraj as the *jagir* of Hasan Khan does not appear to be mentioned by Srivara but he says (l. 10 of the 2nd *taranga*) बह्राम खान नग्रामदेग त स्वामिन अधात ।

⁴ Nagam or Nagrama was a district of considerable extent in southern part of *Madavarajya*

⁵ The name is دولی in one MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah It is rather difficult to decipher it in the other MS and it is دول in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* He is mentioned repeatedly by Srivara in the 2nd *taranga* see line 35-47 etc) but I cannot find his name He is called Lulu by Rodger (JASB vol II p 107) and Luli in the Cambridge History of India p 284 دولی in the text edit on

against anyone with whom he happened to be on bad terms ¹ Hasan Kachhī, who before all others had endeavoured to secure the allegiance of the *amīrs* to the Sultān, was put to death on the accusation of the barber Bōlī

Before this ² Ādam Khān had collected a large army, and had arrived in the country of Jammū in order to fight the Sultān. When the news of the murder of the *amīrs* reached him, he turned back and went to Jammū. He then went to fight some Mughals, who had come to that neighbourhood to aid and reinforce the troops of Mānik Dēv Rāja of Jammū, was struck by an arrow in the mouth and died of that wound. ³ The Sultān was sorrowful on hearing of his death, and ordered that his dead body might be brought from the battle-field, and buried near that of his father.

At that time owing to his (excessive and) continual drinking several serious diseases attacked the Sultān. ⁴ The *amīrs* conspired secretly with Bahrām Khān, and wanted to place him on the throne. When this news reached ⁵ Hasan Khān, who had conquered many

¹ The name is برکشی Bar Kachī in one MS and in the lith ed., and is rather indistinct in the other MS. Firishtah lith ed has Hasan Khān Kachhī. He was called Hasan Kachhī before this in the *Tabaqāt*. And Hasan Koseśa or Hasan the treasurer by Śrīvara. As to his murder see line 79 of the 2nd *taranga* of Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī*.

² See line 107 of the 2nd *taranga* of the *Rājataranginī* of Śrīvara where the Rājā of Jammu or *Madramandala* is called Mānikya Deva and the Mughals are called the *Turuslas*. Firishtah agrees, but he calls the Rājā ملک دیو Rājā Mulk or Malik Dēv. Neither Col Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives his name.

³ See line 110 of the 2nd *taranga* of Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī*, where however the dead body is said to have been buried near that of his mother (नदेशाञ्चव-मानीय जननीसन्निधौ न्यधात्)।

⁴ I cannot find the mention of any actual conspiracy of the *amīrs* or ministers to place Bahrām Khān on the throne in Śrīvara's *Rājataranginī*. It is only said in line 160 of the 2nd *taranga* तावद्धर्मास बह्मस-खानो दामनिरगल । आक्रान्तमन्त्रिस-मन्तो जाला व्यसनिन नृप ॥

⁵ Firishtah, who is followed by Col Briggs and Rodgers, says that it was Fath Khān, son of Ādam Khān who was making these conquests, but the Cambridge History of India, page 284, agrees with the *Tabaqāt* in saying that it was Hasan Khān the Sultān's son who was raiding the Punjab. According to Śrīvara, line 144 of the 2nd *taranga*, he (i.e., Haider Shāh) sent his son

fortress in India and had acquired much booty he with his victorious army returned to Kashmir by forced marches. As his return was without (the Sultan's) permission interested and malicious persons having said words (as if) from his side turned the disposition of Sultan Haidar (from him).¹ The latter being annoyed with him did not allow him to make his *gurnish* and none of his services was accepted.

² One day the Sultan climbed to the polished terrace roof of a palace and occupied himself in drinking. In his drunken condition his foot slipped and he fell down and died.

³ The period of his sovereignty was one year and two months.

4 AN ACCOUNT OF SULTAN HASAN SON OF HAJI KHAN Haidar SHAH

He ascended the throne sixteen days after the death of his father

with an army outside the kingdom for a (conquering expedition). Then in line 179 it is said करदोहनभूपाल म यत्नामहतमिति । अथवधैवमाप्त कम्भीराममनारक ॥ i.e. having made many kings his tributaries and having stayed for six months he became anxious to return to Kashmir at the end of the month of Caitra and then in line 180 he goes on to say that the wicked ministers shrivelled up on Hasan's arrival as lotuses are shrivelled up on the rising of the full moon.

¹ The Sultan's behaviour towards his son as described by Śrīvara Pāṇini cannot be clearly understood. He was apparently afraid of Bahram Khān and so as is said in line 166 he gave his son who had returned from his conquering expedition merely a sight of himself यात्रागमाय पुत्राय ददौ दशनमात्रक and in the next line it is said that he was certainly afraid of Bahram Khān otherwise how was it that he did not honour his son with giving him robes of honour नूनं स्वानुग्रहमौघाभूतत्काश मोक्षया कथं । परिधानादिभूत्कार नूनमेवाकरोत्यते ॥ At the same time he was secretly very angry with Bahram Khān like the tree with the fire concealed in it fearing that the latter might injure the son (ब्रह्मसो बाधते नूनं सत्यमिति शङ्कितं । स तस्मिन् अक्रोधाद्भि शमीनवरिवाभवत् ॥)

The scene and the nature of the accident and subsequent treatment are described by Śrīvara in lines 169-73 of the 2nd *tarāṅga*.

² Neither the *Tabaqat* nor *Itrishah* gives any indication of the date of Haidar Shah's death nor does Śrīvara. But seeing that the death of Sultan Zain ul abidin occurred in the month of *Jyauṣṭha* and Haidar Shah reigned for one year and two months his death very probably took place in the month of *Śravana* in the year 884 A.H. or 1473 A.D.

³ The heading is incorrect in both MSS. One gives the name as Sultan Husain the other omits the name altogether. I have adopted the heading in the lith. ed.

by the exertion of ¹ Ahmad Aswad. On the 10th day (after his accession) he imprisoned some people about whom he had suspicion. He ² went away from Sikandarpūr to Naushahr, and took up his residence there. He gave away the treasures of his grandfather and uncle to (deserving) people, conferred the title of Malik Ahmad on Ahmad Aswad, and ³ entrusted the administration of the affairs to him and made his son named Naurūz Aswad his chamberlain.

Bahrām Khān came out of Kashmīr with his son and went away towards Hindūstān. All his soldiers separated from him, and all his affairs will be narrated later. ⁴ The Sultān again revived all the rules and regulations of Sultān Zain-ul-ʿābidīn which had been abolished in the time of Sultān Haidar, and directed that all affairs should be carried out in conformity with them. At this time, some people, who wanted to create disturbances, went to Bahrām Khān, and incited him to declare war against the Sultān. The *amīns* also wrote letters to him and summoned him. Bahrām Khān returning from

¹ The name is written as احمد ابو سو and احمد ابو سو in the MSS, and محمد اسو in the lith. ed. It is احمد اسود in the lith. ed. of Firishtah, and Ahmad Ahoo in Col. Briggs' History (vol. IV, p. 477). Rodgers (*J A S B* vol. LIV, p. 107) and the Cambridge History of India, page 286, call him Ahmad Aswad, and Rodgers has (the black) in brackets after Aswad. احمد اسو has been adopted in the text edition. Śrīvara in the 2nd *taranga* of his *Rājataranginī* calls him अहमदायुक्त in line 178, and आयुक्ताहमदमहोक्त in line 197. I cannot make out how *Āyul ta* could be transformed into Aswad or *vice versa* Aswad besides 'black' means 'powerful', 'illustrious'. Śrīvara describes the contention between Hasan Khān and Bahrām Khān about the succession, and then after it had been decided in favour of the former, describes the burial of Haidar Shāh (lines 211 *et seq.* in the 2nd *taranga*). This chapter he calls राजवैदरशादराज्यवृत्तान्तवर्णनम् ।

² Śrīvara in line 7 of the 3rd *taranga* says—the Sultān left शिकन्दरपुरी and went to his पितामहविनिर्भित जैननगर. Then he describes the coronation ceremonies, which were highly Hindu in their character, and in which आयुक्ताहमदायुक्तो विधाय तिलक स्वयं । सौवर्णकुसुमै पूजासकरोन्नवभूषते (l. 9), then there was होमधूम in the अभिषेकक्रिया (line 12).

³ This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 23, and the appointment of Ahmad Aswad's son नौरुजा in the दारपालादिकार्य in line 25.

⁴ See Śrīvara, line 33 in the 3rd *taranga*, where he says पितामहसमाचार प्राप्तयत मण्डले ।

the district of ¹ Karma arrived after traversing the hills in the district of Karma. The Sultān had at this time gone to Walipur on a pleasure trip. On hearing the news he went to Suyyapūr in order to fight with him. ³ Some people tried to persuade the Sultān to go away in the direction of India but Malik Ahmad Aswad inciting him to fight did not allow that he should retire towards India. The Sultān approved of the Malik's opinion and sent ⁴ Malik Taj Bhat with a large army against Bahram Khan. The latter had hoped that

¹ The name is کرما Karma in one MS and looks like کرھا Karha in the other. It is کر which cannot be clearly deciphered in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has کرمار Karmar. The text edition has کمرار Kamraj. Śrīvāra in line 41 says कर्माभ्यन्तरत गैलागुलङ्ग कटककटक । क्रमराजपुर प्राज्ञ क्रमराज्य जिहीषया ॥ which means that wishing to seize Kramarāja he arrived at Kramarajyapura from Karnabhyantara after crossing the hills. This is clear and agrees with the Tabagat except that we cannot find what Karnabhyantara mean. Ordinarily it would mean from the interior of Iarna but I cannot find any locality of the name of Karma. Now taking the European authorities I find Col Briggs (vol IV p 477) says Bahram Khan came by the route of Kurmar and Rodgers (J 4 S B vol LIV p 108) says he came by way of the mountains to Kamraj while the Cambridge History of India page 280 says he took refuge in the hills of Karma to the west of Kamraj and he apparently came from there. I cannot find anything about the Karma hills and the names do not agree with that in the Persian chronicle or in Śrīvāra's work.

² It appears from line 42 of the 3rd *taranga* of Śrīvāra's *Rajatarangini* that Hasan was at that time at Avantipura and he returned from there on hearing the news of the return of Bahram. This probably indicates the identity of Avantipura now called Vantipor on the *Utastā* which was in old times probably the most important place in the district of Holad with Walipur. Hasan's return to Suyyapura is also mentioned in line 43 دناپور Dinapur in the text edition.

³ See Śrīvāra line 48 from which it appears that some of the leaders of the ministers said तदन्तर्गत काश्मीरमित्रो गत्वा बहिस्तत though the sentence appears to be somewhat incomplete.

⁴ The name is rather indistinct in one MS but it is ملک نوح Naḥ in the other. The lith ed has ملک نوح Naḥ. Firishtah has only ملک نوح. Col Briggs (vol IV p 478) has Mullih Taj Bhat. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India give the name of the commander of Hasan's army. Śrīvāra in line 54 has सविधदानराजमहिमहादीन अक्षजगप from which it appears that Taj Bhatia or Taj Bhat was the name of one of the commanders.

the Sultān's troops would come over to him; but in the end the contrary happened. There was a severe battle in a village of the name of ¹ Dūlāpūr, and Bahām Khān was defeated and fled, and came to the village of ² Zainagīr. The Sultān's troops hastened in pursuit of him and seized him. An arrow struck him on the face, and all his equipage and other things having been plundered, he was brought before the Sultān in a wretched condition. The Sultān ordered that both he and his son might be put into prison. After a time a blinding needle was drawn across his eyes, and after remaining in prison for ³ three years, he passed away from the world.

⁴ Sultān Hasan (at this time) had Zain Badr, who had been the *vazīr* of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn and the rival of Malik Ahmad Aswad.

¹ The name is لُولُو Lūlū in one MS and in the lith ed. It is لُولُو in the other. Firishtah lith ed has تُولُو. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 478) has Looloopoor لُولُو the reading in the first MS is adopted in the text edition. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name of the place. Śrīvara in line 55 तावद्धामखानसु प्राप दुलपुरान्तर। Dulapura is so near Tūlapūr the name in Firishtah, that I have no doubt it is the correct name of the place where the battle took place, though I cannot find out anything about it. It may be that لُولُو is a corrupt form of Lōlau, the Kashmīrī name of the *pargana* Lōlāb (see Stein, *Rājataranginī*, vol II, p 487).

² The name of the place is زاینکو Zainkar in both MSS and Ratankara in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has مرهاندور Marhanahpūr. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 478) has Zainpoor. Neither Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India furnishes any further light on the matter. Śrīvara in line 59 says अथ जैनगिरि यावदायथौ तद्रणाकुल from which it would appear that he came to Zainagiri dismayed with the result of the battle. Zainagiri or the *pargana* of Zainagiri appears to comprise "the fertile Karēwa tract between the Volur and the left bank of the Pohū River" (Stein, *Rājataranginī*, vol II, p 487).

³ The MSS and the lith ed have سالت three years. Firishtah lith ed, however, has سالت three days and Col Briggs and the Cambridge History of India following him have three days also. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV p 108) says, "He remained in prison for three years after this and then died." The Tabaqāt however, appears to be right, for Śrīvara in line 125 says सत्य वर्षत्रय तावदनुभूतमहावयथ । अस्त्रिगेषतनु क्लेशात्तस्मिन्नेव क्षययथौ ॥ १८, there suffering great agonies for three years, and being reduced to a skeleton from his privations he died.

⁴ This is also mentioned by Firishtah, almost in the same word as the Tabaqāt, but is not mentioned by Col Briggs. It is mentioned by Rodgers,

and who had exerted himself in the matter of the blinding of Bahram Khan and whom Sulṭān Zain ul abidin had on many occasions owing to being annoyed with him wanted to put to death but had not been able to do so seized. And it so happened that on the very day on which Bahram Khan was deprived of his eye sight the needle was drawn across Zain Badr's eyes and he also died in prison after three years.

Couplet

Who'er in some one's eyes put the thorn of tyranny
It behoved that his own eyes were soon destroyed

¹ Malik Ahmad having now become the ruler with full authority sent Malik Yari Bhat who was his favourite with a large

who says that he was blinded with the same needle with which Bahram Khan had just before been blinded. The Cambridge History of India does not mention the matter. It is mentioned by Śrīvara in lines 133 *et seq.* at some length and the particulars appear to agree with those in the Tabaqat but the name of the man does not agree with that given in the Tabaqat or by Firishtah. M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted *ابى بدر* in the text edition but it was *ابى بدر* earlier on p. 678.

¹ The MSS. and the lith. ed. are rather obscure and it is not quite clear whether Malik Yari reinforced the Raja of Jammu or *vice versa* and which of them invaded the Punjab. Firishtah appears to say that Malik Yari reinforced the army of the Raja of Jammu who led the invasion of the Punjab and he looted the country and devastated the city of Sialkot. Col Briggs (vol. IV, p. 48) says that the invasion was undertaken at the instigation of the Raja of Jammoo called Ajit Dew and that the latter took the command of the allied army that he was defeated by Tatar Khan who penetrated into Jammoo and sacked the town of Sialkot. He calls the commander of the Kashmir army Mullik Taj Bhut. Rodgers calls him Malik Bari Bihut and says he was sent to assist the Rajah of Jammu against Tatar Khan who was harassing the borders of Kashmir and that they plundered some part of the Punjab and destroyed the town of Sialkot. The Cambridge History of India, page 285, says that Hasan Shah sent an expedition under Malik Yari Bhat to co-operate with the troops of the Raja of Jammu in ravaging the northern districts of the Punjab where Tatar Khan Lodi represented the military oligarchy over which his cousin Bahlul presided at Delhi. The town of Sialkot was sacked and Malik Yari Bhat returned with as much plunder as enabled him to form a faction of his own. It does not say whether the Raja of Jammu commanded or even accompanied the troops.

It will appear from the above that there is great deal of discrepancy about the facts of this expedition. I am afraid Śrīvara's account does not clear it

army in the direction of the territory of Delhī by way of Rājauri, and 'Ajab Dēō the Rāja of Jammū came and met him, and reinforced him with an immense army. Malik Yārī advanced and fought with Tātār Khān, who was the governor, on behalf of the *Bādshāh* of Delhī, of the foot-hills of the Punjāb, and plundered the whole of his territory, and devastated the town of Siālkōt.

¹ The Sultān had a son by Hayāt Khātūn, who was a descendant of the Saiyids. The Sultān gave him the name of Muhammad and entrusted him for his education to Malik Yārī Bhat. His ² second son was named Husain, and was entrusted to Malik Nūr, son of Malik Ahmad, so that he might bring him up. Some enmity having occurred between Malik Ahmad and Malik Yārī Bhat, they tried to destroy each other, and differences having also come about among the *amīrs*, there were ³ great battles, till one night (the *amīrs*?) collected their men, and getting into the palace of Sultān created

up. It appears that although Ahmad Aswad or *Ahmad Ahmāduktā* had at first befriended Yārī Bhat (Tāji Bhatta), he and his sons were now jealous of him (l. 310 of the 3rd *taranga*). He insinuated that it was no good obtaining the kingdom, if the outskirts were being raided by the enemies (l. 314). Tāji Bhatta then prayed that he might be entrusted with an army to lead an expedition (line 315). He was accordingly provided with it. All the kings who were in the *Madramandala* (Jammu) headed by *Atyābha Dera* ('Ajab or Ajeet Dēō) abandoned Tātār Khān and joined him (lines 319, 320). He caused much damage (७५३४४) in Tātār Khān's country, burning down mosques built by the Khān in *शुगलकोटादि* i.e., in Siālkot, etc (l. 321). Then he quickly returned (line 325). From this it would appear that the expedition owed its origin to a political intrigue arising out of the jealousy of the minister, and more specially of his sons against Tāji Bhatta. *یاری بہت* in the text edition is apparently a misprint for *یاری بہت*.

¹ Compare line 222 in the 3rd *taranga* of Srivara's *Rājataranginī*, which is *अमृतैदान्वये जाता वल्लभा या महीपते । दयानखातोना राज्ञी प्रमाद्व्यासविलासम् ॥* Her son was named Muhammad Khān (l. 226), and was made over to Tāji Bhatta for the purpose of being looked after (*रक्षाय*).

² This is mentioned in lines 328-329 of the 3rd *taranga*, where it is said, somewhat curiously, that he was for being suckled or supplied with milk entrusted to Malik Nauroz *पथोदानाय मल्लेकनौजाय समर्पित*.

³ One MS omits *مہر* great. Firsihtah agrees generally as to these troubles. Both Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India note that the two factions were constantly quarrelling with each other.

¹ various disturbances and set fire to the palace and there was very great trouble in the work of the government The Sultān imprisoned Malik Ahmad Aswad and a number of his relatives and his property was given up to be plundered and he died in prison

The Sultan sent for Sayid Nasir who had been highly esteemed by Sultan Zain ul abidin who had in his assembly accorded him precedents even before himself but who had later been banished from Kashmir and had gone to the territory of Dehli Sayid Nasir died when he arrived near the valley of the Pir Punjal Then (the Sultan sent for Sayid Hasan who was the son of Sayid Nasir and was the father of Hayat Khan from Dehli and made over the reins of authority to his hands The Sayid turned the mind of the Sultān from the Kashmiri amirs and a large number of the chief men of the state were put to death at his instance and by his endeavours Malik Yari was put into prison The other nobles fled out of fear and went to different places Jahangir Malik who was a great nobleman fled to the fortress of Loharkot After some time the Sultan was attacked by a ³ severe form of diarrhoea and he became extremely weak He made a will that is my sons are too young Yusuf Khan son of Bahram Khan who is in prison or Fath Khan son of Adam Khan who is in the country of ⁴ Haswas be

¹ One MS and the lith ed have دست اندازها while the other MS has دست درازها the latter is adopted in the text edition

² The Cambridge History of India page 80 describes him by mistake as chief of the Mahu clan In the text edition it is جهانگیر ناکری instead of جهانگیر ماکری

³ Firsihtah says ار کتب د ا ع نسا ر مری سده طاری where the word نسا ر seems to be redundant کتب د ا ع is translated by Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 108) as over uxoriousness and by the Cambridge History of India page 98 more correctly I think as debauchery

⁴ The name of the place is حسواس Haswas in one MS and looks like حسو in the other and in the lith ed It is حسرونه in the lith ed of Firsihtah and is transliterated as Jasroth by Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 109) Col Briggs (vol IV p 479) does not mention the place but he says that Hussun directed that either Yoosof Khan or Futteh Khan should succeed him The Cambridge History of India does not mention any testamentary direction by Hasan Shah The name of the place does not appear to be mentioned by Srivara who describes the king's illness in somewhat poetic language without specifying any particular disease from which he suffered (line 541 *et seq*)

placed on the throne, and Muhammad Khān should be declared as the next heir. Sayyid Hasan outwardly accepted this. The Sultān died of the illness from which he was suffering.

¹ The period of his reign is not known.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MUHAMMAD SHĀH, SON OF SULTĀN HASAN SHĀH

Muhammad Khān was aged seven years when he attained to sovereignty by the exertions of Sayyid Hasan. ² On that day all articles of gold and silver, and arms and valuable stuffs, and vands etc., were placed before him. He did not pay any attention to any of these things, but took up a bow. Those who were present inferred from this act of his that he would be a great and brave man and said that he would endeavour to rule wisely and well.

The power of the Sayyids attained to such a height, that they did not permit any of the *amīns* and *razīs* to go near the Sultān. The Kashmirīs, being much annoyed at this, ³ one night, in concert with Parasiām, Rāja of Jammū, who for fear of Tātār Khān had taken shelter in Kashmir (i.e., Srinagar) treacherously slew Sayyid Hasan with thirty of the chief Sayyids in the garden at Nau Shahr. They

¹ According to Srīvara he reigned for twelve years and five days (l. 560). According to the Cambridge History of India, page 698, his reign extended to eighteen years from 876 A.D., 1472 A.D. to 894 A.D., 1489 A.D. Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 80) is inclined to believe that he must have reigned for about 19 years, but as Heidur, his father, did not die till 878 A.D., and he died in 891 A.D., the period of his reign could not be more than 13 years in any case.

² There are slight differences in the heading. I have taken that in one of the MSS. The other MS. has Husain instead of Hasan as the name of the preceding Sultān, and omits the word Shāh after the name. The lith. ed. agrees with the first MS. but omits the word Shāh after Sultān Hasan.

³ This is mentioned by Firishtah and by Col. Briggs and Rodgers. Srīvara (4th *taranga*, lines 4, 5) says something slightly different तस्य मिहामनस्यान्ते स्वापिता वस्तुसन्तति । त्यक्त्वा भोजनसामग्रीं पूर्वं शस्त्रोपकरणम् ॥ एतद्विराज्ये सदा युद्ध भविता सण्डलान्तरे । दृष्ट्वा शकुनविज्ञा केयूचसुत्रान्तिकस्थिता ॥

⁴ Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have هیچیک ار امرا و ورا می گذاشتند. It appears to me that the word ¹ should be inserted after ورا, and I have done this. Firishtah lith. ed. has ¹ after ورا.

⁵ The attack on and the slaughter of the Sayyids is described by Srīvara in lines 37–49 of the 4th *taranga* of his *Rājataranginī*.

then crossed the river Bihut (Jhelum) and broke down the bridge and collecting their men sat down on the other side of the river Sayid Muhammad son of Sayid Hasan who was the maternal uncle of the Sultān collected his men and took up his quarters in the palace in order to guard him

One of these nights when a great disturbance was going on and every one was in fear and distress ¹ Abd Zina wanted that he would take away Yusuf Khan son of Bahram Khan who was in prison But one of the Sayid *amirs* of the name of Ali Khan becoming acquainted with the plan slew Yusuf Khan and he also slew ² Baij Bhat who was making lamentations at the murder of Yusuf Khan Yusuf Khan's mother who was called ³ San Devi who from the time when she had become a widow did not eat more than three mouthfuls of barley meal when breaking her fast kept watch for three days in her house over the coffin of her son and after it had been buried had a chamber built for herself near his mau olcum and lived there till the time when she passed away

In short Sayid Ali Khan and the other Sayids collected their retainers and sat down on the bank of the river in order to fight their enemies They spent much money and collected an immense army The people of Kashmir came from all directions in a large

¹ The name looks like عېدى اما and عېدى ربا in the MSS and عېدى ربا in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has عېدى ربا In the text edition it is عېدى ربا Neither Col Briggs nor Rodgers nor the Cambridge History of India gives the name According to Śrīvara Yusuf Khan was killed by a man of the name of Ali Khan when he was being taken away by some of his partisans who are described as यदराजानकाट्टा (the exact meaning of which I cannot make out) who had released him from the prison (see lines 77-79 of the 4th taranga)

The name is written as عاىى به and عاىى in the MSS and عاىى in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has عاىى به Śrīvara calls him पाजभट्ट (4th taranga l 83) It is عاىى به in the text edition

² The name is written as سال دوى and سال دوى in the MSS and سال دوى in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has سال دوى Śrīvara has सावाण देवो (l 88 of the 4th taranga) The facts of her living on यवाग्नि and her living यजीवम (without life) and in यवाजिरे (place of cremation) are also mentioned M Hidayat Hosain has adopted سال دوى in the text edition

body and joined the latter. Skirmishes took place with arrows and muskets, and every day large numbers were slain on both sides. Robbers came into the city openly and plundered and looted. The Saiyids dug a trench round the city so that they might be safe from the robbers. They also razed to the ground the houses of their enemies in the city and the villages wherever they might be, and having plundered their property and cattle, did not, because of great pride, guard their own property. At this time, ¹Jahāngū Mākī, who was at Loharkōt, came to the capital at the summons of the Kashmīrī party, i.e., those opposed to the Saiyids. Although the Saiyids made overtures of peace to him he did not agree. One day Dāūd the son of Jahāngū Mākī and ²Saifī and Ankrī crossed the bridge and fought with the Saiyids. Dāūd and most of his companions (they are called *Mulhālifān* i.e., enemies of the Saiyids) were killed. The Saiyids became ³joyful, and beat drums and made minarets of the heads of their enemies. On another day the Saiyids went to cross the bridge. The enemies met them and there was a great fight near the middle of the bridge. Then the bridge ⁴broke down and many people of the two parties were drowned in the river.

¹ The invitation to Jahāngū (त्रैमार्गेऽन्त्यहागिर) is described in lines 137-42 of the 4th *taranga*, and his arrival by पर्णोत्समार्गे in line 145. The overtures of the Saiyids to him are mentioned in lines 147-151 and Jahāngīr's reply in 155-162. The Saiyids were angry on receiving the reply, and prepared for war (lines 163-165). Then सैफदारजोनराजानकादय crossed the bridge and came to the capital to fight with the Saiyids (line 166).

² The names appear to be سیفی and انکری in the MSS, and in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqāt* انکری and سیفی. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* there is only one name شوق ما کرى. Neither Col. Briggs nor Rodgers have any of the names mentioned in the *Tabaqāt* or in *Firishtah*. In the text edition the name is سدقی داکری. Dāūd is called दावौद, and his death is mentioned in line 178 of the 4th *taranga*.

³ I cannot find any mention of minarets being made of the heads of the slain but in line 190 it is said that the corpses were placed on the road दम्बन-गण्डाल्य इव । Dāūd's head was also cut off and placed राजपथान्तरे (l. 187). The Saiyids also made विजयोत्सव वाद्यै (l. 193).

⁴ The breaking down of the bridge and the falling of सन्नाहभारभग्नाङ्गा अन्तर्हृत् that day in the *Vitastā* is mentioned in line 196 of the 4th *taranga*.

¹ After that the Saiyids wrote letters to Tatar Khan the governor of the Punjab and asked him to come to their help

He sent a large army to help them When his army arrived in the neighbourhood of ³ Bhumbar the ⁴ Raja of the place named Hans fought with them ⁵ and slew their best men The enemies (of the Saiyids) on hearing this news made great rejoicings and for a period of two months there were constant skirmishes between the Saiyids and the Kashmiris At last the latter divided themselves into three troops crossed the river and seized the environs of the hills The Saiyids came to meet them and fought with great bravery but as the number of their enemies was double their number most of their leaders were slain and the rest fled into the city The Kashmiris pursued them and entering the city stretched their hands for slaughter and rapine They set fire to the city and in the conflagration ⁶ the Khangah of Mir Saiyid Ali Hamadani was burnt down and from

¹ Neither the *Tabaqat* nor *Firishtah* mentions it but it appears that after this Jahangir *Jallala Saiphadamara* and others thought of various plans of defeating the Saiyids (l 202) There were frequent skirmishes स नासोदिवसो यत्र द्विजा वीरा पतन्निभि । विद्धा मुमुषवन्नीराद्र नौता खगट्छान प्रति (line 08) and they frequently degenerated into mutual abuse in indecent language (line 210)

² The sending of a तौरख पुष्कल बल by Tatar Khan is mentioned in line 217 of the 4th *taranga*

³ The name is written as بهر Bahaz and بهت Bahtah in the MS and as بهر Bahtar in the lith ed In the lith ed of *Firishtah* it is بنر Banir Col Briggs (vol IV p 183) has Bhumbar and Rodgers Bhumbar In the text edition it is بهنر

⁴ The name looks like پەھ Pe h in one MS and in the lith ed and هس Hans in the other MS *Firishtah* lith ed has هس Hansh and Col Briggs (vol IV p 483) Howns هس نام راحه in the text edition Srivara does not mention the arrival of Tatar Khan's army at Bhumbar but says that on their arrival at *Sastragalasthana* they were met by *Habhabhodana* Raja and others (l 218)

⁵ It appears from Srivara line 273 of the 4th *taranga* that two thousand were slain near the camp of Tatar Khan's army and then the Kashmiris being delighted determined on a war (काश्मीरिका मतसङ्कुरणाय हृष्टमानसा)

⁶ According to *Firishtah* the fire was extinguished on reaching the Khangah and that edifice was not damaged in any way Srivara in line 319 says that the fire reached the Khangah of *अमलदहमादान* but it is not quite clear

there the fire was extinguished. The number of the slain in the course of the day was two thousand. This happened in the year 892 A.H. Saiyid Muhammad, son of Saiyid Hasan got into the house of a man named Gadāi of the ¹ Rāwat tribe, and fortified himself.

The enemies (*i.e.*, the party opposed to the Saiyids) then all collected together in the palace or audience hall, and went to offer their homage to Muhammad Shāh. They got him to join them, and he banished Saiyid ‘Alī Khān and other Saiyids from Kashmīr. ² They now sent back Parasiām after presenting him with various gifts. As everyone of the Kashmiris claimed to be the *sardār* (chief), in a very short time enmity made its appearance among them, and the administration of the government fell into confusion. ³ Fath Khān son of Ādam Khān, who after the death of Tātār Khān, had become the governor of the Punjāb arrived in Rajauri from Jālandar and took up his quarters there in an endeavour to regain his ancestral dominions. As he was the grandson of Sultān Zain-ul-‘ābidīn, ⁴ people, who sought for adventures among the *amāns* and the Saiyids went to him in large numbers, and he giving rewards to each one of them gave them hopes (of further favours). He hoped that Jahāngir Mākri would come before all others, and would see him, but Jahāngir imagining that his enemies had gone before to see Fath Khān, did not join the latter, and dissuaded him from attempting to conquer Kashmīr.

Sultān Muhammad Shāh came out of Kashmīr (*i.e.*, Srīnagar), being persuaded by Jahāngir Mākri to do so, and encamped in the

whether that was burnt down or not. Firishtah also says that the number of persons slain that day was not less than ten thousand.

¹ The word is written as Rāwat in both MSS. In the lith. ed. and the text-edition it is Rāwan, while in the lith. ed. of Firishtah it is راون. In line 339 of the 4th *taranga* of Srīvara’s *Rājataranginī* it is said that Miyan (मेया) Muhammad got into खशिविरान्तर.

² Srīvara in line 347 says ययु परशुरामाद्याः स्वदेशं प्राप्तसत्क्रियाः *i.e.*, Parasurāma (Parasrām) and others went to their own country after receiving honours.

³ The account of his birth, etc., is given by Srīvara in lines 406–410 of the 4th *taranga*.

⁴ This is mentioned by Srīvara in line 419 and the following lines. Then the negotiations between Fath Khān and Jahāngir Mākri are described at some length.

plain of ¹ Karsawar Fath Khan also arrived in the neighbourhood of Audan by way of Hirpur and placing a spring of water between the two armies settled down in front of the Sultan's army. Then the lines of the troops having been arranged the flame of battle blazed up. At first Fath Khan made an onset and it appeared probable that the Sultan's army would fall into disorder. But Jahangir Makri placing his feet firmly slew about fifty of the best men of Fath Khan's army and that army being discomfited Fath Khan was about to be seized when one of the enemies raised a (false cry) that Sultan Muhammad Shah had been taken prisoner by his enemies. Jahangir becoming disturbed in his mind refrained from further pursuit of Fath Khan.

The Sultan came to Kashmir (i.e. Srinagar) after the victory and sent Malik Yari Bhat to ravage the villages which had given shelter to Fath Khan. ² Adam Khan and Fath Khan having disappeared for sometime again raised their heads in the neighbourhood of ³ Bahramgala and for a second time having collected a number of men advanced to conquer Kashmir. Jahangir Makri advanced with an immense army to meet them and encamped in the village of ⁴ Gosawar in *pargana* Nagam. Zirak a servant of Fath Khan availing himself of an opportunity went into the city (Srinagar) and released the large number of *amirs* who were in prison there.

¹ The name of the place is written as کرسوار Karsawar in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of *Firishtah*. In the other MS. it is کسٹوار Kishtwar and in the lith. ed. it is گرسوار Gursawar. Col Briggs and Rodgers do not mention the name of the place. Srivara mentions two names but I cannot find any place mentioned as the camping ground of Muhammad Shah's army which at all resembles the names mentioned in the *Tabaqat* or by *Firishtah*.

² Both MSS. and the lith. ed. have Adam Khan and Fath Khan but Adam Khan had died earlier and so the mention of his name is a mistake. *Firishtah* lith. ed. does not mention him.

³ The name is written as کلہ بہرم or کلہ بہرم in the MSS. and the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqat* and of *Firishtah*. There is a place mentioned in *Srivara Rajatarangini* 4th *taranga* line 580 called *Bhairavagala* of which *Bahramgala* is the modern name. (See Stein's *Rajatarangini* vol. II p. 398.) I have therefore taken Bahramgala as the correct name. The text edition follows the second MS. ha. کلہ بہرم.

⁴ The name is written as کرسوار Karsawar and کوالہ he walahu in the MSS. and گوسوار Gosawar in the lith. ed. and as کہواکہ Kahwahaku in the

Among them were Saifī and Ankiī Jahāngīr was sorrowful at Saifī and Ankiī having obtained their release, and ¹ determined to make a treaty of peace with Fath Khān. He sent a message to the Rāja of Rājaurī, by whose help Fath Khān had invaded the country that he might create disaffection in Fath Khān's army. The Rāja of Rājaurī and other *amīns* separated from Fath Khān, and joined Jahāngīr. Fath Khān in great dismay turned back, and Jahāngīr pursued him as far as Hīrahpur. Fath Khān went to Jammū and conquered it, and bringing great army from that country again advanced to conquer Kashmīr.

² Jahāngīr now gave assurances of safety to the Saiyids, whom he had before this banished from the country, and summoned them, and a great battle took place between the Sultān and Fath Khān. Saifī and Ankiī on the side of the latter fought with great gallantry, and on the side of the Sultān the Saiyids made fine efforts, and behaved with great bravery and courage. ³ A large number of them attained to martyrdom, and the rest who survived obtained the confidence of the Sultān and Jahāngīr. On this occasion Fath Khān was defeated and retired. But he again collected an immense army and invaded Kashmīr, and after fighting several battles, became victorious.

Couplet

If the flower of joy thou seekest, from the thorn of sorrow
draw not thy skirt,

If treasure thou seekest, thy foot into the mouth of the serpent
place

lith ed of Firishtah. In the text edition it is خاسوار Khaswār. Various names are mentioned by Śrīvara in lines describing this meeting, but I cannot find any which at all resembles any of the names mentioned in the MSS of the *Tabaqāt* or the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* and of Firishtah, but in line 598 the battle is called the battle of *Gushkoddāra* (गुसिकाद्वार). (See also Stem's *Rājataranginī*, vol II, p 474 and also note 1 on p 687)

¹ The meaning is not clear. The MSS as well as the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* and of Firishtah all say ارادۃ صلح بفتح حان موده, but apparently it was only a stratagem, and there was no real intention of making a treaty with Fath Khān.

² This is mentioned by Śrīvara in line 570 of the 4th *taranga* of his *Rājataranginī*.

³ See line 596 of the 4th *taranga*.

Things now came to such a pitch ¹ that no one remained with the Sultān and all his treasure was gone. ² Jahangir who was wounded secluded himself in a corner and Mir Saiyid Muhammad son of Saiyid Hasan joined Fath Khan. ³ After some time some *zamindars* seized Sultān Muhammad Shah and surrendered him to Fath Khan. At this time Muhammad Shah had reigned for ten years and seven months. ⁴ Fath Khan kept him in the palace with his own brothers and gave orders that articles of food and drink and all other necessities should be provided for him and Saifi and Ankrī always showed all honour and respect to him and were always at his service.

AN ACCOUNT OF FATH SHĀH WHICH IS ANOTHER NAME FOR FATH KHĀN

He sat on the throne of power in the year 894 A.H. assuming the title of Fath Shah and made ⁵ Saifi and Ankrī respectively the superintendent and administrator of all his affairs.

At this time ⁶ Mir Shams one of the disciples of Shah Qasim came from Irāq to Kashmir and many people accepted him as their

¹ See line 614 of the 4th *taranga*

See line 632 of the 4th *taranga*

³ See line 643 of the 4th *taranga*

⁴ See line 644 of the 4th *taranga*

⁵ In the text edition it is only ذکر سلطان فتح Saif. According to the *Prajyabhaṭṭa's Rajataranginī* सोमराजानक अध्वपतिरेध्वदेमक प्रतीहारपतिद्वान्वय were his three ministers (see lines 16-19). It is impossible to identify any of them with the plain Saifi and Ankrī of the *Tabaqat* and *Ḥinḥat* or with Saffy and Runga Ray of Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 489) or with Saifi Vankari or Saifdar as Rodgers (*J A S B* vol. LIV p. 110) joining the two names jumbles up two persons into one. I cannot find anything about Somaraja or Pratihara but *Adhiapati* or *Adhīapa* seems to be the same as Margeśa or a lord or keeper of the road. Stein thinks that a *margeśa* was equivalent to the *Malik* of the Muhammadan period but I do not think that there is any connect on between the two names.

⁶ He is called शाहकाशिमय द्वाच ६९१कदशज सच्चविज्ञानविन्दोरशेष but it is also added अयं छपदेश विनागुरु the meaning of which is not clear to me (see l. 21). Some person of the name of Somacandra probably the same as *Somaratjanaka* is said to have made over to his servants the lands appertaining to temples (l. 22) and his followers called *Suphas* cut down very tall trees on the pretext of getting fire wood (l. 23).

Ḥinḥat gives some account of the tenets of Mir Shams from which it appears that they were the same as those of the Shī'as in the guise of Sufism.

religious teacher, and all the endowments and property of the religious establishment of Dēvharah were allotted to his disciples, and his Sūfī followers endeavoured to ruin and destroy all the temples of the *Kāfis*, and no one dared to forbid them. In a short time disputes arose among the *amīns* and they came to the palace and slew one another ¹ Malīk Ajhī and Zīnā, who were among the chief *amīrs* of Fath Khān, combined with a number of others, and taking Sultān Muhammad Shāh out of prison, brought him to Bārāmūla, but as they did not find any marks of wisdom in him, they repented of what they had done, and wanted to seize him again, and surrender him to Fath Khān. Muhammad Shāh having got information of this, made his escape one night to another place.

After that, ² Sultān Fath Shāh divided the country of Kashmīr into three equal parts, among himself and Malīk Ajhī and Sankar, and made Malīk Ajhī the *vazīr* with full powers, and Sankar the *Dīwān* or revenue officer of the whole territory (*Dīwān-i-kul*). Malīk Ajhī had wonderful skill in the decision of cases. Among the cases was this: two men had a dispute about an ³ invoice of fine silk

and says that in a short time the people of Kashmīr specially the Chaks became his disciples, and some, who were ignorant, and did not understand his esoteric doctrines, became *mulāhids* or heretics, after his death. For other accounts of his doctrines see the *Tārīkh-i-Rashīdī* (Elias and Ross, pp. 435-436).

¹ The names are written as ملک احی و دان تا and ملک احی و دنا in the MSS and ملک احی و رنا in the lith eds of the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* respectively. In the text edition the names are ملک اچمی و رینا. I cannot find any name in Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* which at all resembles them but see the next note from which it appears that Malīk Ajhī was called मल्लिकार्जुन.

² See lines 70 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* from which it appears that one share was allotted to Fath Shāh (फताहशाह), another to Malīk Ajhī (मल्लिकार्जुन), and the third to Shankar (राजानशङ्कार). The reason of this division is not at all easy to discover. It also appears from line 73 that उद्यमल्लिक had the सुल्यमन्त्रिपद and राजानशङ्कार had the सिद्धादेश.

³ The words are بر سر بیچک تاریک انر اسم, Col Briggs does not mention the matter. Rodgers says that the dispute was about a bale of silk. بیچک in the dictionary is said to mean an invoice, a list. But this meaning does not quite fit in with the context, where the judge is said to have inquired whether the بیچک had been wound with the finger, or on his finger. In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has بر سر بیچک.

Each claimed the invoice to be his and they both agreed as regards the weight and the colour. When the dispute came before Malik Ajhi he asked whether the silk had been wound on the finger or on a spindle. The owner said on the finger and the opposite party said on a spindle. When the silk was unwound it appeared that it had been wound on the finger.

¹ After some time had passed after the accession of Iath Shah Ibrahim son of Jahangir Makri on whom the position of his father had been conferred went to Muhammad Shah and having persuaded him to come from Hindustan brought him to invade Kashmir and a great battle having taken place between him and Fath Shah in the neighbourhood of Kholahuyah Sultan Fath Shah's army was defeated. He retired to Hindustan by way of Haripur. He had reigned for nine years when this happened.

After that Sultan Muhammad sat on the seat of government for the second time and made Ibrahim Makri his *ta'ar* with absolute powers and named ² Iskandar Khan who was a descendant of Sultan Shihab ud din his successor to the throne. ³ The sons of Ibrahim went into the prison and put Malik Ajhi who was their brother in law to death. After some time Fath Khan having collected an immense army again invaded Kashmir and Sultan Muhammad Shah not having the power to oppose him fled without a fight. On this

¹ From line 90 of Prayabhatta's *Rajatarangini* it appears that Fath Shah ruled the country for nine years after which Muhammad Shah regained the kingdom under the protection of the *m rgesa* (Ibrahim).

The name is written as كهولاحوه Kholahuvah and كهوله موه Kaharlah muyah in the MSS. It is كوهامو Kuumuy in the lith ed. of the Tabaqat and in the text edition and كهواسوله Khusulah in the lith ed. of Firishtah. Col Briggs says that the battle took place near Baramoola while Rogers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 111) says it was at Kohasula. I cannot find any name in Prayabhatta's *Rajatarangini* which at all resembles any of these.

² This is mentioned in line 91 of Prayabhatta's *Rajatarangini*.

³ Firishtah lith ed. has by mistake برد near for برهه broth r in law. Col Briggs (vol IV p 488) says that it was the sons of Mulli Atchy and not himself that were put to death. Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 111) says correctly that the sons of Ibrahim Makri put Malik Ajhi to death in prison but he does not mention the relationship between them. Lines 9-94 of the Prayabhatta's *Rajatarangini* agree with the Tabaqat.

occasion the period of Sultān Muhammad's reign was nine months and nine days ¹

Sultān Fath Shāh again took possession of Kashmīr, and made ²Jahāngīr, who was of the tribe of Badīah his *vazīr* and Sankar Zinā his revenue minister (*Dīwān-i-lul*) He ruled justly Muhammad Shāh after his defeat went to ³Iskandar Kakhar, and the latter sent a large force to help him Jahāngīr Badīah was also aggrieved with Sultān Fath Shāh, and joined Muhammad Shāh and brought the latter into Kashmīr by way of ⁴Rājaurī Sultān ⁵Fath Shāh made Jahāngīr Mākī the commander of the vanguard of his army, and sent him to oppose Muhammad Shāh But his army was defeated and ⁶Jahāngīr Mākī together with his son was killed in the battle, and some chief *amīns* of his such as 'Alī Shāh Bēgi and others joined Muhammad Shāh Sultān Fath Shāh being utterly helpless fled to Hindūstān, and died there ⁷His rule this time lasted for one year and one month

Sultān Muhammad Shāh sat on the seat of authority again for the third time, and had the kettledrums beaten ⁸He imprisoned

¹ See line 99 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*

² See line 100 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* This Jahāngīr is called in it प्रतीहारचक्रवर्ती, and Sankar Jma is called राजानप्रहार I cannot find anything about *Pratihara* or *Rājānāśrngāra*

³ One MS and the lith ed have اسکندر ککھر Iskandar Kakhar, the other MS اسکندر کاکي Iskandar Kākī Firishtah lith ed, however, says that he went بر د شاه سکندر شاه لودعی بادشاه دعلی, and he is followed by Col Briggs (vol IV, p 489) and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 111) The Cambridge History of India is silent on this point, and so is Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*

⁴ One MS and the lith ed have ار راء حوری, but the other MS has ار راء را حوری, which is correct and which I have adopted Firishtah lith ed, also has ار راء را حوری The return of Muhammad Shāh is described in lines 120-125 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*

⁵ Compare line 127 which says that Fath Shāh advanced from the capital to fight Muhammad Shāh, aided by only one of his ministers प्रतीहारचक्रवर्ती

⁶ These facts are mentioned by Firishtah, who, however, calls 'Alī Shāh Bākī, 'Alī Shāh Bēg, but they do not appear to be mentioned in Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*

⁷ Compare line 130 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*

⁸ Compare lines 135, 136 Kākī Chak is called चक्रेशकाचन in line 136 He is also called काचचक्र elsewhere (see l 194)

Sankar who was among the great and trusted *amirs* of Fath Shah and selected Kaji Chak who was noted for his wisdom and bravery to be his *ta'ir*. This man had wonderful cleverness in the decision of disputes. Among the disputes one was this. A writer had a wife. It so happened that he remained at a distance from her for some time. The woman in her passions married a second husband. After a time the writer again appeared and there was a dispute between him and the second husband (of his wife). They appeared before Kaji Chak. As neither of them had any witnesses in support of his claim the decision of the matter appeared to be difficult. At last Malik Kaji Chak said to the woman. You are telling the truth and the writer is a liar. Come pour a little water into this inkstand of mine so that I may write a bond (judgement?) for you so that he may have no further dealings with you. The woman got up and put as much water in the inkstand as was required. The Malik said. Pour more. Again she put a little water so that it might not spill the ink and in doing so she showed the greatest caution. The Malik said to those who were present. From the great caution shown by the woman it is evident that she is the wife of the writer. In the end she also acknowledged it and the dispute was settled.

As the government of Sulṭān Muhammad acquired greater stability he ordered the execution of most of the *amirs* of Fath Shah such as ¹ Saifi Anka and others and Sankar Zina died a natural death. The servants of Fath Shah brought his dead body from India. Sulṭān Muhammad Shah went forward to meet it and ordered it to be buried in the neighbourhood of the tomb of Sulṭān Zain ul abidin. These events happened in the year 922 A H (1516 A D).

In the same year Sulṭān Sikandar Lodi the *Badshah* of Dehli died and his son Ibrahim sat on the throne. At this time Malik Kaji imprisoned Ibrahim Makri. Abdul Makri the son of the

¹ Compare lines 16-166 where the execution of *चैकडामरादि* is mentioned in the first and the death of *राजानरादर* or rather his following Fath Shah to the grave owing to the great love he bore him are mentioned in the second.

² Compare line 171 of Prajyabhatta's *Rajatarangini* from which it appears that Ibrahim Makri is there called *चौधराजानक*. He is however called *यन्नाक्षपति*

latter, in concert with some people from Hindūstān, made Iskandar Khān a claimant for the throne, and brought him to Kashmīr. Sultān Muhammad and Malik Kājī advanced to meet them in battle at ¹ Lūlpūr in *pargana* Bāngil. ² Iskandar Khān not having the power to meet them retired into the fort of Nākām. Malik Kājī besieged the fort, and ³ for some days there were skirmishes between the two parties. ⁴ At this time, a number of the *amīns* of the Sultān rebelled against him, and went to Iskandar Khān. Malik Kājī sent his son named Mas'ūd to attack them, and he fighting bravely against them was slain, but the victory remained on his side, Iskandar Khān left the fort of Nākām and escaped, and the Malik entered it. The Mākrīs in distress and disorder followed Iskandar Khān, and Sultān Muhammad Shāh returned to the city joyful and happy. These events happened in the year 931 A H (1524 A D).

It was in that year, that His Majesty, Firdūs Makānī Bābar *Bādshāh* attacked Ibrāhīm Lūdī and slew him in the battle of Panīpat. At this time the disposition of Muhammad Shāh at the insinuations of his enemies turned against Malik Kājī ⁵. He became suspicious, went to Rājaurī and made the Rājas of the various parts of the

in line 173, and his sons मञ्जीकालिकाद्याः are said to have brought फतिहशाहज खानमेस्तन्दरामिध from outside Kashmīr (बाह्यात्) (l. 174)

¹ The name is written as लोलपूर, and लोलपूर in the MSS and as लोलपूर in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has لون پور برگنه ماعكل, but the name is not very distinct. Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*, line 175, has लौलपुरीङ्गाम्. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 490) calls the place Alwarpoor in Fankul district, and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p. 112), apparently following Firishtah, has Nolphin in the *parganna* of Māhekal. The name of the *pargana* is بالکل, or بالکل in the MSS and بالکل in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*. The correct name is Bāngil (No. 31 in the list of Kashmīr *parganas* on page 494 of Stein's *Rājataranginī*, Vol II).

² Compare line 176 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*.

³ Compare line 178 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*.

⁴ The account in Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* is somewhat different. It is said there that प्रतीहारपति अचङ्गे with others (who were the rebels) entered the fort of Luhara, and the Cakrapa, i.e. Kājī Chak, finding two armies on his two sides (अर्द्धाध सहित शत्रुसैन्यम्), sent his son मञ्जीदचक्र to attack Luhara (lines 179, 180). The fight of Masa'ud's army with the Lohara garrison and Masa'ud's death are described in lines 182–190.

⁵ This appears to be mentioned in line 218 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*.

country obedient to himself At this time Iskandar Khan who had gone away after being defeated by the Sultān came back with a¹ number of Mughals and took possession of Lōharkōt² Malik Yari brother of Malik Kaji hearing of it went and attacked him and having fought with him seized him and sent him to the Sultān The Sultān being pleased with Malik Kaji on account of his loyal services again entrusted the post of the *ra'ārat* to him³ He had Iskandar's eyes blinded by drawing the needle across them

At this time Ibrahim Khan son of Sultān Muhammad Shah who had gone with his father to Sultān Ibrahim Ludi when the latter had furnished Sultān Muhammad Shah with a large army and had given him permission to return to Kashmir but had kept Ibrahim Khan in his service came to Kashmir owing to the catastrophe which had overtaken Sultān Ibrahim Ludi Malik Kaji who was annoyed with the Sultan on account of his having blinded Iskandar Khan put him and his immediate attendants by every pretext that he could think of into prison After having imprisoned him⁴ he raised Ibrahim Khan to the throne

¹ Firishtah says that these Mughals belonged to or were sent by Firdus Makani Zahir ud din Muhammad Babar *Budshah*

² He is called Tajacakra in line 230 in which it is said that he and his other heroic brothers slew the Mughals in a battle in लोहरादिप ।

³ This is mentioned in lines 236-237 in *Prajyabhatṭa's Rajatarangini*

⁴ The matter of the deposition of Muhammad Shah मल्लोदयः । वसुधाव्यभक्त as it is called in *Prajyabhatṭa's Rajatarangini* begins in line 245 where the author exclaims on the strange act of Providence (विधानं) by which Muhammad Shah lost his kingdom by the act of his own son In line 248 it is said that on Ibrahim Ludi's defeat Ibrahim Khan came to Kashmir cherished by his father's affection (पितृव्यविषदित) In the following line it appears that Kaji Chak's evil intention towards the Sultan made its appearance on account of his wish to seize the kingdom (राज्यजिहीषया) and he in his anger cast the राजानं । राजां न मल्लोदयः । दीन into prison and from line 250 it appears that the चक्रराज swallowed up the मल्लोदयः । वसुधा i.e. the sun called Muhammad Shah It would appear therefore that according to the chronicle it is not true that Kaji Chak cast Muhammad Shah into prison because he was annoyed with him for having caused Sikandar Khan to be blinded but he did so to gratify his own ambition It is true that the chronicler after stating the fact moralises that धर्म फलति कालेन सर्व पापको हि सोऽभवत् । खानस्यान्ध्याद्वाथ । यामुद्दाम्यधराशुभस्य सा (l. 254)

The period of the reign of Muhammad Shāh was, on this occasion,
¹ eleven years and eleven months and eleven days

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN IBRĀHĪM SHĀH, SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH

² When he sat on the throne, he made Malīk Kājī his permanent *vazīr* according to previous custom ³ Abdāl Mākri son of Ibrāhīm Mākri, who had gone to India to escape the tyranny of Malīk Kājī, having at this time entered the service of His Majesty Firdūs Makānī, submitted to him, that he had sought an asylum at that threshold, from the violence of his enemies If His Majesty would help that slave with an army, he would conquer Kashmīr for the servants of His Majesty in the easiest possible way His Majesty, ⁴ after obtaining the necessary information, about his appearance and character, said in kind language, that ⁵ even in jungles such men could be met with He honoured Abdāl Mākri with the gift of a horse and a robe of honour, and detached ⁶ a large number of troops to accompany him He made ⁷ Shaikh 'Alī Bēg and Muhammad Khān and Mahmūd Khān the commanders of the detachment

¹ This agrees with Firishtah and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 113), but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 491) says that Mahomed had reigned for nineteen years, when he was deposed, but it is not clear whether this was the period of his reign in the third term Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* (l 253) makes it eleven years, ten months and ten days (एकादशान् दश मासान् दिनानि च)

² Compare lines 257 and 258 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*

³ Compare line 260 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* where Bābar is called दिल्लीप सुगुलेखरस् ।

⁴ This is stated by Prājyabhatta as आकारेक्षितवाक्चेष्टासम्पूर्णं वीक्ष्य भार्गव । चणु तुष्कराजौष्मद्विसयानतकन्धर' । (l 261) from which it would appear, that Bābar was greatly impressed by what he saw of and heard from Abdāl Mākri

⁵ It is rather difficult to understand the mention of jungles but Firishtah also has the same word The idea probably is that Bābar was probably surprised that a country like Kashmīr, which he thought was covered by forests, could produce such a fine looking and able man As the *Rājataranginī*, in the line I have quoted, says, he lowered his head in astonishment

⁶ Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* (l 262) says सद्यसह्या वीराणां सेनास्य प्रतिपादिता ।

⁷ All the three names appear in both MSS and in the lith.ed, but Firishtah lith. ed omits the second name, and he is, of course, followed by Col Briggs and Rodgers Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* (l 265) also has the first and third

As Abdul Makri perceived that the Kashmiris would ¹ hate the coming of the Mughals he advanced towards Kashmir having for political reasons given the name of Sultan to Nazuk Shah son of Fath Shah. On the other side Malik Haji took Ibrahim Shah with him and made the village of ² Sullah in the *pargana* of Bangil his camping ground. The two armies encamped in front of each other. Abdul Makri sent the following message to Malik Haji ³ 'I waited on Babar *Badshah* and have brought reinforcements from him. The power and grandeur of that *Badshah* are so great that he made Sultan Ibrahim the *Badshah* of Delhi who had five hundred thousand men in the twinkling of an eye like the dark dust. Your welfare lies in this that you should come into the band of his loyal adherents. But if this great fortune is not in your lot come quickly and fight with this army. There is no time left for remedy or hesitation. Malik Haji made ⁴ Sauid Ibrahim Khan and Srang and Malik Yuri the

names which it transforms almost beyond recognition into शिवाक्षभग and मन्नाद खान ।

¹ Rodgers (*J L S B* vol LIV p 113) I think quite incorrectly translate the words $\sim \sim$ بنظر حوائد by the words 'would despise'.

² Firishtah lith ed incorrectly calls Nazuk Shah the son of Ibrahim and he is followed by Col Briggs and by Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India page 287 agrees with the *Tabaqat* and calls him the second son of Fath Shah. Prajyabhatta's *Rajatarangini* (I -66) has पतिराजशिव खान राजाजोकथापययितम् ।

³ Both MSS and the lith eds of the *Tabaqat* and of Firishtah have در موضع صلاح ابرو کنه با فعل. Col Briggs (vol IV p 49) has Sullah in the district of Fankul and Rodgers (*J L S B* vol IIV p 113) has Sulah in the *pargana* of Bankul. The Cambridge History of India III page 287 says the battle took place at Naushahra (Nowshera) but does not give any authority. According to Prajyabhatta (I -66) the Cakrapati Qili Chak plied his army at Nilasva. The place is mentioned in various places of Kalhana's *Rajatarangini* as a district of Kashmir. In the text edition $\sim \sim$ is changed to $\sim \sim$ while in the English translation following Stein (vol II p 481) Bangil has been adopted.

⁴ A part of this adjuration of Abdul Makri appears in lines -69- 1 of Prajyabhatta's *Rajatarangini*.

⁵ The commanders are called यथाक्षखान सेरकमेर and मन्नाद राजा in line 273 and those of the other army are called मन्नादखुदर दिगक्षक मन्नाद and

commanders of three detachments, and began the battle. A great fight took place between the two armies, and many were slain. And of the renowned nobles of Ibrāhīm Shāh, Yāri Chak, and Sarang and others, each of whom had large number of followers, were slain. Malīk Kājī in great distress fled to the city but he could not stay there also, and went away towards the hilly country. Nothing is known about Ibrāhīm Shāh, as to what happened to him, and where he went. The period of his rule was eight months and twenty-five days.

AN ACCOUNT OF ¹NĀZUK SHĀH, SON OF FATH SHĀH

After the victory, ² he ascended the throne in the city of Srinagar, and gave assurances of safety to the Kashmīris, who were afraid and suspicious of the Mughals. The Kashmīris then made rejoicings at his accession. And he then left the city, and took up his abode in Nau Shahr, which from ancient time was the capital of the Sultāns. He selected Abdāl Mākri to be his *vazīr* and representative (*vakīl*). Abdāl went as far as the ³ country of Jamalnagarī in pursuit of Malīk Kājī, but whom he found that it would be impossible to seize him, he commenced to make a division of the country. Leaving aside the *Khālsa* or the crown lands, the country was divided into

-

शिखिभिर्ग which are probably identical with Malīk Lōhar and Malīk Rēgī Chak, and शिखिभिर्ग seems to be another form of शिखिबिर्ग the name of Shaikh 'Alī Bēg. See the latter part of note 7, pages 696, 697. The battle is described with some spirit in line 275 and the following lines and the death of Yāri Chak (called मल्लिक तालिक) is mentioned in line 282, and that of Sarang in the next line. The flight of Qādī Chak to the city is mentioned in line 284. In the text-edition سرمك has been adopted in place of سرنگ.

¹ He is also sometimes called Nādū Shāh, as the name is Nādū on all his coins (Rodgers, *J A S B*, vol LIV, p 114) but all the histories call him Nāzūk Shāh.

² Compare lines 285-287 of Prājyabhatta.

³ The words are تا سواد حمل نگرى or تا سواد حمل نگرى in the MSS and in the lith eds of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 492) has "The town of K'hulnagiy", and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 114) has "the confines of Jahalnagarī". In line 288 of Prājyabhatta it is stated that गता जमालनगरा सन्निपत्य मन्त्रिण though it is not said there, that they went there in pursuit of Malīk Qādī. In the text-edition it is چهل نگرى.

four shares ¹ One share was allotted to Abdal Makri the second to Mir Ali the third to Lohar Makri and the remaining to one of the Chaks Abdal Makri then sent back the servants of Irdus Makani to Hindustan after giving them many presents and valuable gifts They sent an angry message to Malik Haji and summoned Muhammad Shah to come to them - and going to Mir Ali brought Muhammad Shah out of the fort of Loharkot and they all came together to Kashmir (i.e. Srinagar) They did not permit Malik Haji to come

Sultan Muhammad Shah then sat for the fourth time on the throne and he made Nuzuk Shah ² who had governed the country for twenty years his successor At this time His Majesty Irdus Makani departed from this transitory world and His Majesty Innat Ashraf Muhammad Humayun *Badshah* sat on the throne of the empire This happened in

¹ The division is mentioned by Firishtah and Rodgers with some differences and also in Prayjabhatta's *Rajatarangini* lines 288-290 but no one gives any reason for the division The division as given in Prayjabhatta's *Rajatarangini* agrees with that in the Tabaqat the four shares being allotted in it respectively to मल्लिकाव्याजक अलीमर सागमलहर and रियचक्र। It is curious that according to Mirza Haidar Dughlat (page 411 Flins and Ross's translation of the *Tarikh-i-Rahidi*) he found the following four Maliks in Kashmir Abdal Makri Kijichak Lahur Makri and Yakehak Three of the six names appear to agree with those who got three of the shares The fourth अलीमर or Ali Mir had been killed in an engagement with the Mirza himself

Firishtah's account is somewhat different According to him Shaikh Mir Ali went to Loharkot and brought Muhammad Shah with him According to Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.* vol LIV p. 114) Abdal Makri recalled Muhammad Shah from his prison of Lanarkot and the two i.e. Abdal and Muhammad Shah entered Kashmir as friends This does not appear to me to be quite correct Prayjabhatta in lines 290-296 mentions the message sent to the Cakras the sending back of the Mughals and the going of Ali Mir to Muhammad Shah

² Firishtah says he had governed the country for twenty years and eight months Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.* vol LIV p. 114) has 20 years and 0 months the number of months is of course incorrect Prayjabhatta in line 298 has राज्य कल्पाय वर्षे २ ० व्या नाजिकी उप । अथ राजा द्यापु प्राप योवराज्य नवम्भदात् । i.e. the King Najika (Nazuk) having reigned for one year obtained the position of heir apparent from King Muhammad The period of Nuzuk's reign certainly was not twenty years he ascended the throne in 933 A.H. 1537 A.D. and was deposed and made heir apparent in 93 A.H. 1599 A.D. so he reigned for a little more than a year as stated by Prayjabhatta

the year 937 A H When one year of the reign of Sultān ¹ Nāzuk Shāh had elapsed, Malik Kājī Chak, who had gone to the hilly country collected a vast number of men there, and came to the neighbourhood of ² Kahrāi Malik Abdāl came and confronted him, and fought with him Malik Kājī fled and went to Hindūstān

At this time, Mīrzā Kāmīān had absolute power on the Punjāb Shaikh 'Alī Bēg, Muhammad Khān and Mahmūd Khān, ³ who had, after the conquest of Kashmīr returned with the permission of Abdāl Mākai, represented to Mīrzā Kāmīān, "As we have acquired a knowledge of the whole country of Kashmīr, if you pay a little attention, the whole country can be conquered with the greatest ease" ⁴ Mīrzā Kāmīān appointed Mahiam Bēg to be the commander of his army and sent him to conquer Kashmīr in concert with the nobles who had joined them When the Mughal army arrived in the neighbourhood of Kashmīr, the inhabitants in great terror left all their property and things in their houses, and fled towards the hills The Mughal army

¹ Both MSS and the lith ed have Nāzuk Shah, but this is clearly a mistake Firishtah has شاه محمد اول, i e, of the reign of Muhammad Shāh, which is correct

² Both the MSS and the lith ed of Firishtah have كهرار Kahrāi The lith ed of the Tabaqāt has پونجرار Punjhrār Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 114) has Kahrār Prājyabhatta has सप्तमेन्द्रेष्वपै सार्द्धं युद्धेच्छुः काचचक्रम् । मौर्वीरग्रामादगमत् ससैन्योद्य दिगन्तरम् (l 301) which does not, however, make one much wiser as to the locality

³ Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 114) says, "Shaikh Ali Beg and Muhammad Khān the leaders of the allies who had helped Abdāl Mākai, and who had left him without permission" This is totally incorrect As a matter of fact they were sent back with many presents and valuable gifts In the particular passage under translation both Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say رحمت نا and not رحمت ل In the text edition it is رحمت

⁴ This is mentioned by Prājyabhatta (l 303) Mahiam Bēg being transformed into महोमायस्वपति and Mīrzā Kāmīān into मेरेज-कामराण and the following facts are mentioned (lines 304-308) that शिखालभिग, महोदखान and other Mughals accompanied the Mughal army, that Muhammad Shāh and others quickly brought back the *Chakresā*, i e, Qādi Chak to help him, that the Mughals having invaded the city with thousands of horses and elephants, the Kashmīris took shelter in the fort, and the Mughals burnt down and looted the houses and cities, etc

then looted the city and set fire to it. Some of the Kashmiris who had returned from the hills to fight with the Mughals were slain. Abdal Makrī had a conviction at first that Malik Kaji was with the Mughals but when he knew at last of a certainty that he was not with them he showed friendship and attachment towards him and summoned him with his sons and brothers and they made promises and bound one another by oaths. This became a source of strength for the Kashmiris and they set their heart on a battle and combined together and engaged the Mughals in a big fight. ¹ The latter considering it advisable to do so went back to their own country.

After some time Malik Kaji having seen the treachery and pride of Malik Abdal did not consider it desirable to remain in the country and went to Hindustan. ² It was in this year that is in 939 A.H. that Sultān Sayyid Khan the *Badshah* of Kashghar sent his son Sikandar Khan in company with Mirza Haidar Kashghari with twelve thousand men by way of Tibet and Lār to invade Kashmir. The Kashmiris (frightened) at the rumour of their power and grandeur evacuated Kashmir and without any battle fled in different directions and sought shelter in the hilly country. The Kashghar army having entered the Kashmir territory razed the grand edifices which had been built by the old Sultan to dust and set fire to the city and the villages and having searched for the treasures which were buried under the ground seized them and all the soldiers loaded themselves with the booty and went everywhere to find the Kashmiris who had

¹ This appears to be described in a very metaphorical language in line 311 of *Prajyabhatta's Rajatarangini*.

² Firishtah agrees but says Malik Qad Chak went to Bhur. Rodgers (*JASB* vol LIV p 115) says Malik Gaji Chakk could not endure the prosperity of Abdal (which is not at all correct) so he betook himself to Bhur. Prajyabhatta gives (l. 312) the reason and the fact of the departure of Qad Chak very succinctly namely मगधनादभवत् काचचक्रा वदिययौ i.e. being alarmed at the scanty regard shown to him by the Mughals i.e. Abdal Makrī Kaca Cakra left the country.

³ Firishtah agrees almost *verbatim*. The invasion of the Kashghar army is mentioned Prajyabhatta in line 314 etc. It is said to have been commanded by Mirza Haidar (मिर्जाहैदर) and Sikandar Khan is not mentioned in the beginning but is mentioned further on in line 331.

hidden themselves, and slew them and took them prisoners. This state of things went on for ¹ three months.

And Malik Kājī Chak and Malik Abdāl Mākī and other renowned *sardārs* went to and took shelter in ² Chakdhar, but as they did not consider it advisable to remain there, ³ they descended from the mountains in the direction of Khāwairāh, and having resolved

¹ Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 115) contrary to both Nizām-ud dīn and Firishtah has six months. Prājyabhatta (l 325) also says that the Kashmir chiefs fought with the *Mlecchas* for three months.

² The name is written as چکدھر in both MSS, and as جکومر in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has چکدر. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 494) has "the town of Chukdura," and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 115) has Chakdara, but no attempt has been made by anybody to identify the place, and I also have not been at all successful. Prājyabhatta (l 324) has जलवाण-युक्तासु भूपभूमिषु शिथिलः । कामौरिकायननाथा आश्रयान् स्वेच्छशङ्कया, i.e., the commanders of the Kashmir army, fearing the *Mlecchas*, obtained asylum in the *Bhūpabhūmis* (whatever they might be) which were covered with water, but I have no idea as to what the *Bhūpabhūmis* were and where they were situated. The next line, however, mentions three places, Ciroddāra, Hājyengakotta and Cakradhara, but the line goes on to say युत्वाभ्यवाहयन् मासत्रयं स्वेच्छै प्रयुध्यते । If युत्वा is a mistake for त्रित्वा, then the line would mean that taking shelter in Ciroddāra, Hājyengakotta and Cakradhara, they carried on the war with the *Mlecchas* for three months, and then Chakdara or Chakdhar would probably be Cakradhara, but unfortunately I cannot find anything about Cakradhara also, and I cannot alter *Srutvā* to *Srtvā*. In the text-edition it is چکدھر.

³ The readings here are different. One MS has کتاب کھاورہ و اراٹکا, the other has کتاب کھا و ریادہ و اراٹکا, the lith ed has کتاب کھادرہارہ و اراٹکا, the lith ed has کتاب کھادرہارہ و اراٹکا, the lith ed has کتاب کھادرہارہ و اراٹکا, the lith ed has کتاب کھادرہارہ و اراٹکا. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 494) has (they) "retreated to Baramoola living occasionally in the hills." Rodgers says that from Chakdara "they went to Khāwairāh and Bāradār. From this place by the way of Bādah they descended from the mountains." Prājyabhatta does not give much help. He says (l 330), चक्राधारादेत्य भूपेन्द्रयुक्ता भौमादेवौसन्निधौ सन्निवेशः । चक्रुस्तौर्ल । लेदरीवासपार चक्रेशाद्या मार्गपा आहवाय । If Cakrādhāra is identical with Cakradhara, then we find that the Kashmiri leaders coming from Cakrādhāra or Cakradhara encamped near Bhīmādevī after crossing the Ledarī, for a battle, but there is no mention of any places like this in Nizām-ud-dīn or Firishtah. In the text-edition مار ناوہ is apparently a misprint for مار ناوہ.

to engage the Mughals in battle went forward from there by way of Marbiwah. The Sulṭānzada Iskandar Khan and Mirza Hardai also came forward with an immense army to meet them. ¹ There was a great battle and Malik Ali and Mir Husam and Shaikh Mir Ali and Mir Kamal among the Kashmiri commanders were slain. Of the Kashgharis also some good men met their death. The Kashmiris wanted to turn their backs on the battle field but Malīk Kaji and Abdul Makri placed their feet of bravery firmly and persuading and encouraging the others did justice to their bravery and gallantry. So many men were slain on the two sides that they were beyond all calculation. Some headless bodies rose up and moved about. The reason of this has been mentioned on a former occasion. The battle between the parties went on from morning till evening. When night came on the two armies taking note of their plunder went back to their respective places. Both sides coming out of the battle agreed to a settlement. The Kashghar men sent camelot the warm woollen cloth (purpet) and other beautiful things to Sulṭān

¹ The account of the battle as given by Firsihtah agrees with that in the text except that Mir Husam is called Mir Hāsan. He is also called Mir Hāsan in one of the MSS of the *Ṭabaqāt* but he is called Mir Husam in the other MSS and in the lith ed. Col Briggs and Rodgers generally agree but the statement made by Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.* vol. I IV p. 11) that the prisoners were run to the ground on both sides and were liberated does not appear to me to be correct. The Cambridge History of India page 87 only mentions the battle briefly but the statement made in it that the army of Kashmir fought so fiercely from morning until evening that the invaders were fain to make peace is also not correct. The advantage if any lay on the side of the invaders as the Kashmiris at one time were about to retire and in any case both sides were anxious for peace. The battle is described by Irjā' al ḥaṭṭa in lines 31 to 33* and here we have not only the headless bodies mentioned by Firsihtah and Firsihtah but *बबलनका यवन वैनाररायमा । महामायाजनयमा ।* i.e. the dancing headless bodies *Yakulanaras Yetalas and Rakas* as they are called feed on human flesh.

² The presents according to the MS were *صوف و سقرات و سار و بلی* the lith ed. has *سقلاب* instead of *سقلاب* a reading the lith ed. is a purpet. Firsihtah agrees with the MSS but changes *سار* to *دیگر*. Col Briggs does not mention the presents but Rodgers (*J.A.S.B.* vol. I IV p. 115) has world hawks and precious things. Neither the Cambridge History of India nor Irjā' al ḥaṭṭa a *Pāṭarānginī* mentions the presents.

Muhammad and ¹agreed to a relationship. Sultān Muhammad also in concert with Malik Kājī and Abdāl wrote a treaty of peace, and sent it with the wonderful products of Kashmīr to the Kāshghar people. ²It was also settled that Sultān Muhammad's daughter should be given in marriage to the Sultānzāda Sikandar, and the Kashmīrī prisoners still in the custody of the Mughals should be released. The Kāshgharīs agreed to this treaty, and turned towards Kāshghar, and the disturbances which had been caused in Kashmīr became changed to peace and prosperity.

During this ³year two comets or stars with tails rose above the horizon. A terrible famine took place in these days so that most of

¹ For an explanation of this see the *Tārīkh-i-Rashidī*, p. 441 where it appears that, "everyone, according to his rank, formed a connection (*mulālāt*) with one of the Sultāns or Maliks of Kashmīr." Mirzā Haidar became connected with Muhammad Shāh, and according to "the Moghul practice we called each other 'friends'." Similar relations were formed between the other Moghul leaders and the Kashmīr nobles.

² Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 115) gives what appears to me to be a quite incorrect account of these terms. He says, "the Kāshghar party taking with them presents of wool, hawks and precious things, went to Muhammad Shāh, and asked his daughter in marriage to Sikandar Khān, and desired that the women whom the Mughals had in their hands, should there remain." Neither Nizām ud dīn nor Firishtah says that the Kāshghar people went to their presence, and asked for Muhammad Shāh's daughter. They both say that it was settled that the marriage would take place. Prājyabhatta in line 342 makes a curious statement about the marriage of the princess, *सदेश सुगुणा ययु । बलात् पौरत्रिय सान्नादाय राजसुतामपि ।* This would mean that the princess was taken away by conciliatory methods.

³ The comets and famine are mentioned by Firishtah and Col. Briggs. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, mentions the famine but not the comets. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 116) mentions two comets and the famine, and with reference to the latter, he makes the curious statement, "The massacre of Zuljir was regarded no less severe than this famine in its effect," which is very different from what Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah say about the matter as would appear on a comparison of my translation. He had also apparently forgotten that he had called *Zuljir* *Zuljū* on page 99 of his paper. According to Prājyabhatta (l. 344) there were not two comets, but there was a rain of meteorites everywhere on the ripe paddy fields, and then a comet made its appearance. The line is *पक्षशालिवरस्फातिपूर्णक्षेत्रेषु सर्वतः । नभससारका*

the people died of hunger and the remainder who survived abandoned their native land and went away to distant places and the story of Dilju who had perpetrated a general massacre having sunk into oblivion in people's minds appeared as of no importance in comparison to this catastrophe. These hardships continued for ten months and then ceased and as the fruit season also drew near some happiness made its appearance among the people.

During this period a disagreement occurred between Malik Haji and Abdal Malik and the former coming out of the city took up his residence in Zainpur. Malik Abdal continued to be the Sultan *ra'is* and the governors and the officers perpetrated every kind of oppression that they wanted on the *ra'iyats* and no one was there to attend to their complaints. After some time Sultan Muhammad Shah suffered from a burning fever he gave away all the gold that he had to the poor and needy and passed away from the world as a result of the same illness. The period of his reign was ³ fifty years.

प्रेतभूय केतुरदण्डतः । The famine is described in lines 345-378. It is said (l. 350) that चन्द्रालम्बेकाद्य पुण्यरता हि ते । प्रत्यहं तपुस्तपते पक्षाग्निं पुपुषजनः ।

¹ Compare line 360 of Prayjabhatta. The place where Qadi Chak took up his residence is called Jainapura in this line. Zainapor is mentioned in the Index of Stein's *Rajatarangini* but the page reference vol II page 47^a against it is incorrect on page 471 however it is stated that from the small town of *Jainapura* founded by him the new subdivision took the name of Zainapor or Jainapura.

² The illness and death of Muhammad Shah and his adjurations to his ministers are described in Prayjabhatta's *Rajatarangini* lines 365-373. He seems to have suffered from various complaints and not from the *سحر* alone mentioned by Nizam ud din and Firishtah as it is said सहासो देहो दुष्टैरिवामये । स्वस्वावासादयैरनै पीडया जज्जरीकृतः ।

³ Firishtah also says he reigned for fifty years and Rodgers (*JASB* vol LIV p. 116) explains this by saying that The fifty years must reckon from 891 A.D. and include all the reigns of Fath Shah and Nazuk Shah. It is noteworthy however that Prayjabhatta (l. 373) says that he reigned for five years वषात पञ्च हन्ती भूयो राज्यं कृत्वा. His last or fourth reign extended from 935 to 941 A.D. 1009-1014 A.D. which is about 5 years so that the fifty of Nizam ud din and Firishtah may be a mis-tale for five.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN SHAMS-UD-DĪN, SON OF SULTĀN
MUHAMMAD SHĀH

² Sultān Shams-ud-dīn sat on the throne of the empire after his father, and divided the whole country, in agreement with his *vazīr*, among the *amīns*. The people of Kashmīr made rejoicings on his accession. But in a very short time there were disputes between Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākī, and the former carried the Sultān away in the direction of Gōswā to fight with the latter. Abdāl also came forward to meet him with a ³ complete army. But in the end a peace having been determined upon, Abdāl went away to Kamrāj, which was his *jāgīr*, and the Sultān and Malik Kājī returned to Sīnagar. ⁴ Again after some time Abdāl Mākī turned his head from allegiance, and commencing to make disturbances created confusion in Kamrāj. This time also the disturbance was quelled with ease. Nothing more than this can be gleaned from the *Tārīkh-i-Kashmīr* about Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, and the period of his rule.

¹ Both MSS. and the lith. ed. omit the word بن the son, after Shams ud dīn. Firishtah lith. ed. has it. I have inserted it.

² Firishtah agrees, but Col. Briggs (vol. IV, p. 496) following the *Touarikh-Kashmeery* calls the successor of Muhammad Shāh, Ibrahim, and not Shams-ud-dīn. Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India follow Nizām-ud-dīn and Firishtah. Prājyabhatta devotes some lines (374–376) to the people's lamentation on the death of Sultān Muhammad, and calls the new Sultān शसगाह (l. 380) a very abbreviated form of Shams-ud-dīn Shāh. It also mentions the rejoicings of the high and the low (महान्त' पामरा' सर्वे) and their blessings in line 382. Then we suddenly come to the disputes between the two factions, but it is difficult to discover any reason for them. The two armies were stationed at गर्धमोड्डार and जलगदान्तिक, and then Rīgacakra went as an intermediary, and concluded a settlement to the effect that Kācacakra (Qādī Chak) should remain at the capital and the Mārgapas (Mākris) in Kamrāj (l. 389).

³ نا استعداد تمام in the text edition is apparently a misprint for استعداد تمام.

⁴ As to the account of the latter part of the reign of Shams ud-dīn and the reign of Nāzūk Shāh, Firishtah agrees almost word for word, and so does Rodgers. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, says that Shams-ud-dīn II died in June or July 1540, when Nāzūk Shāh was restored. The account in Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* is very confused. It mentions the intrigues of the leaders and the incursions of the Mughals (l. 403) but I have not been able to discover anything about Shams ud-dīn or Nāzūk Shāh.

cannot be ascertained After him his son Nazuk Shah sat on the seat of government but five or six months had not passed when Mirza Haidar having acquired power in the country took possession of it During the period of his rule public prayers were read and coins struck in the renowned name of His Majesty Jinnat Ashiani
¹ Humayun *Badshah*

AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF MIRZĀ HAIDAR

In the year 948 A.H. at the time when Jinnat Ashiani having been defeated by Sher Khan had come to Lahōre Abdal Makri and Regi Chak and some other of the chief men of the Kashmir sent a petition through Mirza Haidar containing expressions of their loyalty and incitements to him to seize the country His Majesty (i.e. Humayun) gave Mirza Haidar permission to go and also decided to follow him himself When Mirza Haidar arrived at ² Bhimbar

¹ One MS omits by mistake the passage from محمد همانی to حب اسنانی including the heading about the rule of Mirza Haidar

² He is called Zangi Chak in the lith ed of Firishtah Zungy Chuk by Col Briggs (vol IV p 498) and Zangi Chakk by Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 117) and the Cambridge History of India and the translators of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* also call him Zangi Chak but the name is رنگی حک in both MSS of the *Tabaqat* and more distinctly رنگی حک in the lith ed Of course there is very little difference between رنگی and رنگی as written in Persian रिंगचक्र or रिंगचक्र is mentioned by Prayjabhatta in lines 388-393 and elsewhere *Riga Chakra* may be transformed to Regi Chak but cannot be changed to Zangi Chak Regi Chak is therefore the correct name and I have kept it رنگی حک in the text edition is incorrect

³ The name looks like بھر in the MS The lith ed has بھر and Firishtah lith ed has بھر Col Briggs (vol IV p 498) has Mein and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 117) has Bhir The Cambridge History of India does not mention the name of the place I consulted the fountain head for the correct name but Mirza Haidar is delightfully vague in the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* page 483 where he says when I arrived at the foot of the pass (leading to) Kashmir Kachi Chak ascended (?) by one road and we by another and without further contention or discussion we (all) arrived at (Kashmir) I cannot find any place of the name of Bhir but Bhimbar or Bhimbhar lies at the foot of the outer hill in the centre of the tract between the Vitasta and the Cinab note 180 page 33 Stein's *Rajatarangini* So I think Bhimbar is correct and I have kept it In the text edition Mirza Hidayat Hosain has بھر

Abdāl Mākri and Rēgi Chak came and joined him. There were not more than four hundred horsemen with Mīrzā Haidar. When he arrived at Rājaurī, Kāji Chak, who was (then the *de facto*) ruler of Kashmīr, came with three thousand horsemen and fifty thousand foot soldiers to the ¹ Karmal pass, and strengthened it. Mīrzā Haidar abandoned that route, and started by way of Punj. Kāji Chak in his great pride did not guard that road, and Mīrzā Haidar, crossing the hill, arrived in the Kashmīr plateau, and suddenly took possession of the city of Srinagar. Abdāl Mākri and Rēgi Chak having secured a footing, took charge of all affairs, and allotted some *parganas* as the Mīrzā's *jāgīr*. It so happened that about this time Abdāl Mākri's days came to an end, and he died after recommending his sons to the Mīrzā.

After the arrival of Mīrzā Haidar in Kashmīr, ² Kāji Chak went to Shēr Khān Afghān in Hindūstān, and brought five thousand horsemen, who were commanded by Husain Shaiwānī and ³ 'Ādil Khān

¹ Firishtah has کتل کرتل and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 498) has Kurmul pass. In the text-edition کیرتل has been changed to کیرتل. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV) p 117, has transformed Katal Kartal to "Khabal Kartal (it is called Karmal by Erskine)", and he has transformed بئج, which is written as بئج in the MSS and in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt and as بئج in Firishtah lith ed out of all recognition to "Pabhaj (the Pamij of Erskine)". Col Briggs comes very near the correct name and calls it Punnuj. The Cambridge History of India, page 288, does not give the name of the place, where Kāji Chakk was stationed, but gives the correct name (Pūnch) of the pass, by which Mīrzā Haidar crossed the hill. It makes the statement that Mīrzā Haidar's allies "engaged Kāji Chakk's attention by threatening a frontal attack", but I cannot find any authority whatever for it. Both the Tabaqāt and Firishtah simply say that he abandoned that route, and Mīrzā Haidar (whose words I have quoted in the preceding note) whatever he says or means, does not mention any threat of a frontal attack by his allies on Kāchi Chak.

² According to Mīrzā Haidar (*Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, p 485), there was an interval of some months between his arrival, and Kāchi Chak's bringing the troops from Shīr Khān. Mīrzā Haidar crossed the pass into Kashmīr on the 22nd of Rajab. Then the winter came on, and it was not till the beginning of spring that Shīr Khan's troops arrived. Just then Abdāl Mākri was attacked by paralysis and died.

³ The name is 'Alāwal Khān in one MS and in the lith ed, but it is 'Ādil Khān in the other MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah.

and two elephants to reinforce his own troops Mirza Haidar in concert with Regi Chak advanced to meet him in battle The two parties arrayed their forces between the villages of ¹ Datarbar and Kawah and the breeze of victory having blown on the plumes of the standards of Mirza Haidar the *amirs* of Sher Khan and Kaji Chak were routed Kaji Chak took up his residence in ² Bahramgalah Mulla Muhammad Yusuf the *khatab* (preacher) of the Jama Mosque of Srinagar ³ obtained the date of the victory in the words *Fath i Mukarrar*

In the year 950 A H Mirza Haidar took up his residence in the fort of ⁴ Indarkōt ⁵ Owing to Mirza Haidar having entertained suspicions about Regi Chak the latter fled and went to Kaji Chak and the two united together and in the year 951 A H advanced towards Srinagar with the object of destroying Mirza Haidar's power Bahram Chak son of Regi Chak reached Srinagar Mirza Haidar nominated Bandagan Kokil and Khwajah Haji Kashmiri to crush

¹ The names are دتر بارو and کاوره in one MS and in the lith ed and مارو and دده کاوره in the other MS Firishtah lith ed has دده دبار and کاوره The *Tarikh i Rashidi* gives various particulars which are not to be found in the *Tabaqat* or in Firishtah but does not give the names of these villages Col Briggs (vol IV p 499) has Dhunuj and Gava and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 117) has Danahdyar and Kawah The Cambridge History of India does not give any name In the text edition the names are دتر بارو and موصع کاوره

² Bahramgalah has wrongly been changed to سرم کاله Parinkalah in the text edition

³ The meaning is not clear some words having probably been omitted I have however supplied the omission by a reference to page 485 of the *Tarikh i Rashidi*

⁴ According to the *Tarikh i Rashid* page 485 Mirza Haidar is said to have placed his and his followers families in the fort of Andarkul when he was going to fight Kachhi Chak and Shir Khan's armies The translators say in a note that this must be the Indrakot of Firishtah Firishtah however would not dream of writing Indrakot he has Indarkot It may be noted however that there is a *pargana* called Andarkoth among those of the Kamraj tract (Stein vol II p 494) So Indarkot may be correct

⁵ Firishtah agrees but Col Briggs makes various mistakes Rodgers's account follows Firishtah The Cambridge History of India page 288 apparently follows Col Briggs about Zangi (Regi) Chak's becoming suspicious of Haidar's attitude instead of Haidar becoming suspicious of him

him, and he was unable to meet them, and fled. When the Mīrzā's troops pursued him, Kājī Chak and Rēgī Chak, considering flight the safest course, took up their quarters at Bahramgalah. Mīrzā Haidar left Bandagān Kōkah and others at Srīnagar and advanced to conquer Tibet, and seized the fort of ¹ Kōsūr, among the great forts, and some other forts.

In the year 952 A H, Kājī Chak and his son Muhammad Chak died of a ² shivering fever. Mīrzā Haidar passed the year in peace. In the year 953 A H, Rēgī Chak fought with the *amīns* of Mīrzā Haidar, and was killed, and his head with that of his son Ghazī Khān was brought before Mīrzā Haidar.

In the year 954 A H, an ambassador arrived from Kāshghar. Mīrzā Haidar went to Lār to welcome him. Ūjh Bahām, son of Mas'ūd Chak, who for seven years had fought bravely in Kamīāj and had defeated everyone there, made proposals of peace to Khān Mīrak Mīrzā, and made conditions and engagements. Khān Mīrak Mīrzā summoned him after making promises and taking oaths. But when Ūjh Bahām came to his *majlis*, he drew a dagger out of his boot, and stabbed him in the stomach. The man, wounded as he was, fled and got into the jungle. Khān Mīrak Mīrzā hastened in pursuit of him, and seizing him cut off his head, and brought it to Mīrzā Haidar at Lār, believing that Mīrzā Haidar would be pleased. ³ Īdī Zīnā, after the food had been brought in, rose up in great

¹ The name of the fort is کوسور and الوسوا in the MS, and کوسوار in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has لوسور, Col Briggs (vol IV, p 499) has Looshoo, and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 117) has Lansūi. The *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* is of no help, as it ends with Mīrzā Haidar's victory.

² تب لرزه, instead of لرزه in the text edition.

³ It is not clear who he was. He was apparently someone in authority, for Mīrzā Haidar thought it necessary to excuse himself on the ground of his ignorance of Mīrak Mīrzā's acts (Jān Mīrak Mīrzā in the text edition). He is, however, named, a few lines below, as one of the leaders of the vanguard of the army sent to conquer Kishtwār. Both the MSS say بعد از حاضر ساختن طعام. The lith ed omits the word طعام. Firishtah says nothing about anything being brought. If the reading in the MSS is correct, the production of the head was delayed till the food was brought in, apparently with the object of giving it a special relish. In the text-edition the name is عیدی زینا, Īdī Rainā, but Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 118) has Īde Zīnā.

anger and wrath on seeing the head and said It is not right to kill a person after making conditions and engagements Mirza Haidar said I had no information of these happenings

After this Mirza Haidar advanced from Lar to Kishtwar He made ¹Bandagan Kokah Muhammad Makri Makna Mughal Mirza Muhammad Yahya and Idi Zina the commanders of his vanguard and himself remained in the village of ²Jhalu near (the boundary of) Kishtwar The vanguard after traversing marches of three days in one day arrived in the village of ³Dohut which was on their side of the river Marma The Kishtwara army was on the opposite side of the river There was a skirmish of arrows and musket shots but neither party could cross the river The following day Mirza Haidar's army turning from the right road wanted to get into Kishtwar When they arrived in the village of ⁴Dar a strong wind

¹ The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS and the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* with slight variations Firsihtah lith ed omits the third and makes Mirza Muhammad Yahya Zina one man Col Briggs (vol IV p 500) only gives the name of Bandagan Kola and add with other officers Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 118) follows Firsihtah but calls the last man there Yahy Zina The Cambridge History of India does not give any name

² The name looks like *جہار* and *جہانر* in the MS and *دو جہانر* in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* Firsihtah lith ed has *جہانر* Col Briggs does not mention the place but Rodgers following Firsihtah calls it Jhapur The place is not mentioned on page 21 of the Introduction to Fries and Ross's *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* where the editors speak of the expedition against Kishtwar In the text edition it is *جہالو*

³ The name of the village looks like *دوہ* and *دوہ* in the MSS It is *دوسہ* in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* and *دھنوب* in that of Firsihtah Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 118) has Dahlot No name is given in the introduction of the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* but it is said that the advance guard came up with the enemy on the banks of the Kishtwar river The name of the river is *ماربا* or *مارما* or *ماربا* in the MS and the lith ed of the *Tabaqat* Firsihtah lith ed has *مارما* Col Briggs does not give the name and Rodgers says where the river winds In the text edition *دوہ* is adopted as the name of the village

⁴ The name of the village is *دار* in one MS and in the lith ed and *دال* in the other MS It is Dhar in the lith ed of Firsihtah and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 118)

rose, and it became dark. The Kashmīrīs came bravely in crowds and attacked them. Bandagān Kōkah, who was the leader of Mīrzā Haidar's army, was slain with many others. When they started from there, Muhammad Mākri and his son with twenty-five principal men were slain on the road. The rest, who had escaped death from the sword, came and after suffering much privations, joined Mīrzā Haidar. The Mīrzā coming back from there in the year 995 A H, advanced towards Tibet and conquering Rājaurī from the Kashmīrīs made it over to ¹ Muhammad Nazr and Sabr 'Alī. He gave Paklī to Mullā 'Abd-ul-lah and little Tibet to Mullā Qāsim, and conquering great Tibet appointed a person of the name of ² Muhsin to be its governor.

In the year 956 A H, Mīrzā Haidar turned his attention to the fort of ³ Danil. Ādam Kakhar came there, and prayed for the pardon of the offences of Daulat Chak, nephew (brother's son) of Kājī Chak. Mīrzā Haidar granted the prayer, and sitting with Ādam in his pavilion, summoned Daulat Chak to come there. The latter ⁴ became angry, and rose up, and taking the elephant which he had brought with him as a tribute, went away. Some persons wanted to pursue him, but Mīrzā Haidar forbade them.

¹ The first name is Muhammad Nazr in both MSS and the lith ed. The second name is Šabr 'Alī in one MS and حنر علی which may be a mistake for بدر علی in the other, and Mīr 'Alī in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has Muhammad Nazir and Nāsir 'Alī. Col Briggs does not mention the names, and Rodgers gives the names after Firishtah. No names are given in the introduction (p. 21) to the *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, which contrary to Nizām ud-dīn and Firishtah's account, that he seized Rājaurī, Paklī, Little Tibet and Tibet in the order mentioned, says that he conquered Little Tibet (or Baltistan), Tibet (or Ladak) and subsequently Rajaori and Pakhlī.

² The name is محسن نامی in both MSS and محسن نامی in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has Mullā Qāsim.

³ The name is دمل and دملی in the MSS, and دیهل in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has دیل. Col Briggs (vol IV, p. 501) has Deebul, and Rodgers (*J. A. S. B.*, vol LIV, p. 118) has Danel. In the text edition it is دمل.

⁴ Firishtah surmises that عالاً چناسکه مرصی او بود اعرار و اکرام بها بیاوردد as the probable reason for Daulat Chak's anger.

After some time Mirza (Haidar) returned to Kashmir ¹ Daulat Chak and Ghazi Khan and Hasan Chak and Bahram Chak went to Haibat Khan Niyazi who having been defeated by Islam Khan had come to Rajouri Islam Khan had also come to Madwar belonging to the Naushahrāh area in pursuit of the Niyazis ² He sent Sayyid Khan Abd ul mulk one of his trusted servants to Haibat Khan and Sayyid Khan having introduced matters about an amicable settlement brought the mother and sister of Haibat Khan to Islam Khan The latter then turned back and coming to the village of ³ Ban in the neighbourhood of Sialkot took up his quarters there The Kashmiris mentioned above took Haibat Khan to ⁴ Baramula and wanted to take him to Kashmir in order to do away with Mirza Haidar (with his help) He however could not make up his mind to do so and sending a Brahman to Mirza Haidar made proposals for peace Mirza Haidar sent ample funds by the hand of that Brahman and Haibat Khan leaving the place where he was went to the village of ⁵ Bir which is a dependancy of the territory of Jammu ⁶ The

¹ Firishtah substitutes Jai Chal for Hasan Chak and is followed by Rodgers Firishtah however has the name of Haibat Khan correctly but Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 118) converts it to Haidar Khan though a few lines further down he has Haibat Khan Niyazi

The name is Madwar in one MS and Badwar in the other and in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has Madwar The article ¹ appears to have been omitted before ² in the MSS and the lith ed

³ Firishtah (and following him Col Briggs) and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 118) say that it was Haibat Khan who sent Sayyid Khan Niyazi to Islam Shah

⁴ The name is Ban in one MS and in the lith ed It looks like Man in the other MS Firishtah lith ed and Rodgers have Ban but Col Briggs (vol IV p 502) has Bhimbur

⁵ The MSS have ¹ and the lith ed has ² but Firishtah lith ed has ³ which I think is correct It is ⁴ in the text edition

⁶ The name is ¹ and ² in the MSS and ³ in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has ⁴ Col Briggs (vol IV p 50) has the town of Subzeeā while Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 119) has Hir and says that it is Nir in MS No 6571 in the British Museum ⁵ has been adopted in the text edition

⁷ Firishtah and Col Briggs and Rodgers agree Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 119) says that he has seen two coins of Islam Shah of this time

Kashmīrīs separated from him, went to Islām Khān, but Ghāzī Khān went to Mīrzā Haidar

In the year 957 A H, Mīrzā Haidar, becoming assured in his mind of the condition of the outskirts of the country, sent Khwājah Shams Mughal, with a large quantity of saffron, as an ambassador to Islām Khān, and in the year 958 A H Khwājah Shams returned with many presents, and much rich stuffs, and Yāsīn Afghān came from Islām Khān with Khwājah Shams, and Mīrzā Haidar gave (many) shawls, and much saffron to Islām Khān's ambassador, and gave him permission to return

He then appointed Qarrā Bahādur Mīrzā to the government of Bahaimal, and sent 'Īdī Zīnā and Nāzūk Shāh and Husam Mākī and Khwājah Hājī from amongst the Kashmīrīs with him ¹ Qarrā Bahādur and the Kashmīrīs left Indarkōt, and took up their quarters at Bāiāmūla, and commenced to create disturbances on the ground that the Mughals looked down on them. The Mughals represented this to Mīrzā Haidar, but the latter did not believe it, and said that the Mughals were not in any way better than the Kashmīrīs in the matter of creating disaffection and disturbance ² Husam Mākī sent his brother 'Alī Mākī to Mīrzā Haidar, to make him acquainted

and adds that the Kashmīrīs were tired of Mīrzā Haidar, and wanted to have Islām Shāh as their king, and the coins were struck in anticipation of his conquering the country, or they might have been struck by Mīrzā Haidar himself in compliment to Islām Shāh

¹ Firishtah agrees, but Rodgers wrongly translates the words *ار اندر کوب* *بر آمده* which are in the lith ed of Firishtah as well as in the Tabaqāt, by the words "came back to Indarkot" The sentence, as it stands, means that Qarrā Bahādur and the Kashmīrīs all commenced to create disturbances, but apparently it was the Kashmīrīs who did so Rodgers's translation of the words *ار اندر کوب* *که معان ایسا را در دہار می آرند* by the words that "the Mughals (the forces of Mīrzā Haidar) were not acceptable to them" also appears to be incorrect

² Apparently Husam and 'Alī were not acting in concert with the other Kashmīrīs There are slight differences in the wording of the sentences I have adopted the reading quoted by one of the two MSS which makes most sense, but I have had to change the last word *المید* which is in both MSS to *طلند* Firishtah lith ed has *طلند* Rodgers's translation (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 119) in which he reads the word *عذر* as *عذر* (excuse) appears to me to be incorrect

with the treachery of the Kashmiris so that he might decide to recall the army Mirza Haidar took no notice and refused to listen to him and said What cause of jealousy should the Kashmiris have against you that they should act treacherously towards you and did not summon the army back

On the 27th of the Ramadan there was a great conflagration in the Indarkōt and most of the houses were burnt down Qarra Bahadur and all the men sent the following message Our houses have been burnt down if you will give an order we would come and repair our houses and turn our attention next year to Baharmal Mirza Haidar did not at all agree to this and the army had to proceed to Baharmal whether they liked it or not

Idi Zina and all the Kashmiris then combined together and when night came they separated themselves from the Mughals and came to the pass of Baharmal They also separated Husam Makri and Ali Makri from the Mughals and took them with themselves so that they might not be slain with the Mughals In the morning there was a battle between the Mughals and the men of Baharmal and the former were entangled and confined in the hills Suvid Mirza however fled to Dabil About fifty renowned Mughals were slain and Muhammad Nazr and Qarra Bahadur were taken prisoners The rest who escaped the sword came by way of Punch to Bahramgūh Mirza Haidar was deeply grieved on hearing this news and ordered that the broken silver *degs* (sauce pans) which are now current in Kashmir be coined He also made Jahangir Makri his trusted agent and bestowed the *jagir* of Husam Makri on him He also gave horses and money to many of the craftsmen and made soldiers of them Just after this news came that Mulla Abdullāh on hearing of the rising of the Kashmiris

¹ The name looks like *دغل* and *دیل* in the MSS and *ومل* in the lith ed and appears therefore to be identical with Danil see page 71 and note 3 Firuhtah lith ed however has *دغلی* *قلعه بهرمل* in the text edition is certainly incorrect

² There is a word which looks like *سہمی* or *سہمی* Sahi in the MSS and in the lith ed which I cannot make out but which may be made of copper Firuhtah lith ed has *زرکمه* in the corresponding passage *سہمی* has been adopted in the text edition

was coming to meet Mīrzā Haidar, but when he arrived near Bāramūla the rebels who had collected in large numbers slew him, and Khwājah Qāsim was slain in little Tibet, and Muhammad Nazr was taken prisoner in Rājaurī, and the Kashmīrīs having collected in large numbers had come from Bahramgalah to ¹Hirahpūr Mīrzā Haidar, having no other alternative, ²came out of Indarkōt, with the intention of engaging them. The total number of men with him was only a thousand. Among the Mughals men like ‘Abd-ul-rahman and Shāhzāda Lang, and ³Khān Mīrak Mīrzā and Mir Makta and ⁴Ṣabr ‘Alī and others, who were altogether about seven hundred men, joined him, and they took up their quarters at Shihāb-ud-dīnpūr.

Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān and other notable leaders in concert with ‘Īdī Zīnā collected their men, and came to Hirāpūr, and leaving that place came to the village of Khānpūr. Mīrzā Haidar encamped in the plain of Khāldgarh, which is close to Srinagar. Fath Chak, whose father had been slain by the Mughals, raided Indarkōt with Rāja Bahram and three thousand men, in order to avenge his father’s death, and burnt down the buildings erected by Mīrzā Haidar in the *Bāgh-i-Safā*. When Mīrzā Haidar heard this news, he said, “I did not bring these edifices from Kāshghar. With Divine favour similar ones can be built.” Ṣabr ‘Alī burnt down the edifices of Sultān Zain-ul-‘ābidīn, which were in Suyyapūr, in retaliation of the burning down of Mīrzā Haidar’s buildings, but the Mīrzā was not pleased at this. (They) also burnt down the houses of ‘Īdī Zīnā and Naurūz

¹ The name is clearly Hirahpūr in the MSS as well as in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has what looks like Habzāpūr. Col. Briggs’s account (vol. IV, pp. 502, 503) is very sketchy, the whole of the incident from the appointment of Qarrā Bahādur (called Kuran Bahadur) to Baharmal (called Bheerbul) to the death of Mirza Heidur being narrated in the space of eight or nine lines, and the name of the place under consideration is not mentioned. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 120) calls the place Hambarapūr.

² Rodgers translates امر اندر کوٹ ہوا as “came to Indarkot.”

³ حان میرک منبرا in the text edition is a misprint for حان برک منبرا.

⁴ The name is حری علی in one MS and the lith ed., and حری علی in the other MS. Firishtah lith ed has حری علی, but Rodgers has Jai Ali. In the text-edition میر مکنہ is a misprint for میر مکتہ.

Chak in Srinagar After this Mirza Haidar came and took up his residence in Khanpur In this village there is a ¹ plane tree in the shade of which two hundred horsemen can stand and it has been found by trial that whenever a single branch of it is moved the whole tree shakes The writer of this history Nizam ud din Ahmad was in attendance when the sublime standards of His Majesty the Khalifa i Ilahi went on a visit to Kashmir for the second time and he saw the tree and examined it In short the Kashmiris moved from Khanpur and came to the village of Adanpur and the distance (between the two armies) was not more than ³ two *karohs*

Mirza Haidar then decided that he should make a night attack on the enemy and he gave direction that Mirza Abd ur rahman his brother who was adorned with the attributes of piety and purity should become his heir and took the allegiance of his men to him Then they all mounted and started for making the attack As decreed by fate there were heavy clouds that night When they arrived near the tent of Khwajah Haji who was the cause of the disturbance and also the *takil* (agent or representative) of the Mirza nothing could be seen owing to the darkness Shah Nazr a cuirassier says At this time I shot an arrow The voice of Mirza Haidar came to my ears which said ⁴ thou hast done an evil thing I knew that my arrow had hit the Mirza It is also narrated that a

¹ The name is *بد* in one MS and *حمار بد* in the other The lith ed has *حباري حبار* and *حباري* may be mistakes for *حمار* Chunar or the plane tree while *بد* is a willow Frishtah lith ed has *بد* and Rodgers has willow Both plane trees and willows grow in Kashmir but I should be inclined to think that the tree in question was a plane tree which is a tall spreading tree

Both MSS have *ادب نور* The lith ed has *ادب نور* Frishtah lith ed has *ادبي نور* and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 190) has Adnipur

³ It should be noted however that just before this apparently the two armies were both in *Khanpur*

⁴ The readings in the MSS are *مباح بولدی* and *مباح بولدی* and in the lith ed *مباح بولدی* These are all incorrect unless *بولدی* or *بولدی* is same word in the dialect of Kashmir Frishtah lith ed has *مباح کردی* which I have adopted The whole affair is mysterious Although it was dark the cause of the death could have been ascertained Then why was the corpse or in fact the man who was on the point of death left lying where he had fallen

butcher hit his thigh with an arrow. Another tradition is that ¹Kamāl Kōkah slew him with the sword, but there was nothing (visible) on his body except a wound caused by an ²arrow. In short, when the morning came, it was bruited about, that a Mughal, who had been killed, was lying there. When Khwājah Hājī and his son arrived at the spot, they saw that it was Mīrzā Haidar. They raised his head from the ground. There was no more than breath left. The dying man opened his eyes, and surrendered his life to the creator. The Mughals fled to Indaīkōt. The Kashmīris going in pursuit of them ³took up the corpse of Mīrzā Haidar to the Darbadū Mausoleum, and buried it.

The people were sorely grieved at the death of Mīrzā Haidar. The Mughals got into Indaīkōt, and fortified themselves in it, and fight went on for three days. On the 4th day Muhammad Rūmī ⁴shot Kashmīri coins from mortars, and every one, who was hit, was killed. At last, ⁵Khānam, the widow of Mīrzā Haidar, and his sister said to the Mughals, "As Mīrzā Haidar has gone away from us, it is better to have peace with the Kashmīris." The Mughals accepted this, and sent Amīr Khān, the architect, to the Kashmīris to conclude a pact. The Kashmīris agreeing to a peaceful settlement gave a letter containing engagements and oaths to the effect that they would not cause any trouble to the Mughals.

The period of Mīrzā Haidar's rule was ten years.

¹ The name is کمال دوتہ in the MSS and کمال دوی in the lith ed. I cannot find any meaning of دوتہ or دوی. Frishtah lith ed has Kamāl Kakah and I have adopted it. The reading in the MSS is followed in the text edition.

² One MS has رحم تیر و تدر و حندر دیگر, which is of course incorrect. The other has رحم سر و تدری دیگر, which appears to be correct. The lith ed is also incorrect, it has رحم سر و تدری دیگر. Frishtah lith ed has the same reading as the second MS, and this is followed in the text edition.

³ It is curious that the Mughals did not even attempt to carry away the Mīrzā's dead body, and it was left to the Kashmīris to bury it. The MSS as well as the lith ed say that they buried the body in در بدو مرار. I cannot find out what this burial place was. Frishtah only says that the Kashmīris seeing the body of the Mīrzā buried it.

⁴ There are slight differences in the readings.

⁵ She is so called in the MSS and in the lith ed. Frishtah lith ed calls her حاجی and it calls the Mīrzā's sister حاجی.

AN ACCOUNT OF NAZUK SHAH

When the gates of the fort (of Indarkot) were opened the Kashmiris entered the ¹apartment containing valuable furnitures etc belonging to Mirza Haidar and carried away fine and delicate goods. They brought the family and dependants of Mirza Haidar to Srinagar and placed them ²in the house of Hasan Matu. They divided the country of Kashmir among themselves and *pargana* ³Devsar was allotted to Daulat Chak and that of ⁴Wahl to Chazl Khan and that of ⁵Kamraj to Yusuf Chak and Bahram Chak. One *lakh* of ⁶donkey loads of paddy (or rice in husks) was allotted to Khwajah Haji the *takil* of Mirza Haidar. Daulat Chak gave *pargana* Devsar which was his *jagir* to his son Habib Chak and the daughter of Idi Zina was married to the latter. The *amirs* of Kashmir and more specially Idi Zina having gained complete power raised Nazuk Shah on the throne and kept him as a puppet but in fact Idi Zina was the *Badshah*.

¹ The word is *نوسک خانه* which according to the dictionary is a wardrobe and which Rodgers calls the treasury. It is really what I have called it in the text. There is or at least was some years ago what was called a *Talukhina* correctly *Tusul Khana* of the government of India in which the articles offered to the Viceroy at the Darbars were kept.

I have not thought it necessary to point out all the mistakes in Rodgers's paper but I cannot pass this over. The words both in the *Tabaqat* and in *Firishtah* are *اعل و عيال صبرا را در سری نگر اوردد و در حوالی حسن مبروحا دادند* but *مدر* of the *Tabaqat* is *مدر* in *Firishtah*. My translation is based on the text. Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 121) has the family of the Mirza was taken to Srinagar and placed in the hands of Manuj.

³ Given as one of the S E *parganas* see list on page 369 of the *Itin-i-Akbari* (Jarratt vol II).

⁴ It is written as *وہی* in both MSS and the lith ed. *Firishtah* lith ed has *وہی* and I have taken this in preference to *وہی* as it is probably identical with *Wih* one of the *parganas* east of Srinagar (*Itin-i-Akbari* Jarratt vol II p 368).

⁵ *Kamraj* is called a tract containing 16 *Malal* page 30 of the *Itin-i-Akbari* (Jarratt vol II) but there is a *pargana* also of the name of *Kamraj* included in the S W *parganas* of the *Kamraj* tract.

⁶ *یک لک حروار سالی* i.e. a *lakh* of donkey loads of paddy is transformed into a *lakh* of shawls by Rodgers (*J A S B* vol IV p 121).

In the year 959 A H Sankar Chak, son of Kājī Chak, wanted to go away from Kashmīr (i.e., I suppose Srinagar), as Ghāzī Khān who called himself the son of Kājī Chak and had much *jāgīr*. The details of this statement are these, that Sankar Chak was the son of Kājī Chak without any difficulty or doubt, and Ghāzī Khān although he was commonly known to be the son of Kājī Chak was not in reality his son, for Kājī Chak, after the death of his brother Hasan Chak, took the latter's widow, who was then with child (who was afterwards named Ghāzī Khān), and after two or three months the child was born. Hence Sankar Chak on account of the envy (which he bore) to Ghāzī Khān wanted to leave Kashmīr and go to ¹ 'Īdī Zinā. When a rumour of this got about, Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān sent ² Isma'īl Hāyat and Harjū, with one hundred men to summon Sankar Chak. They told them that if he did not come with them they were to bring him by force. Sankar Chak did not come on their summons, and went to 'Īdī Zinā. In the end 'Īdī Zinā came to them, and made an amicable settlement, and the *parganas* of ³ Kothār and Khāwar and Māwar having been allotted to Sankar Chak the disturbance subsided.

At this time, there were four groups who had power in Kashmīr (1) 'Īdī Zinā with his group, (2) Hasan Mākri, son of Abdāl Mākri

¹ It is not at all clear where he was

² The name is written as *امہیل ریایت* in one MS and in the lith ed. In the other MS the last half of the name is written as *ہایت* without any dots above or below the second or third letters. This second part is distinctly written as *ہایت* in Firishtah lith ed., and Rodgers has *Hanūt* *امہیل ہایت* has been adopted in the text-edition.

³ The names of the *parganas* are not very easily decipherable. They look like *کوہنہار و کھادر و ماور* in one MS. In the other they are the same except that the first is *کوہنہار*. In the lith ed there is apparently only one name *کوہنہادر ہارہ*. Firishtah lith ed has *کوہنہار و کھادر و ماور* and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 122) has Kothār Khāwīn and Maduū. In the list of *parganahs* in the *Āin-i-Albani* (Jarratt, vol II, p 369) there are two *parganahs* Khattār and Khāwarpārah, and I think it very probable that Sankar Chak got these. In the tabulated list of Kāsmīr Parganas in Stein's *Rājataranginī* (vol II, pp 493, 494) I find Kutahār, but no trace of any of the other. In the text-edition the names are *کوہنہار و کھادر و ماور*.

with his group (3) the ¹ Kishtwaris whose leaders were Bahram Chak and Yusuf Chak and others and (4) the Kamis of whom Haji Chak Daulat Chak and Ghazi Khan were the leaders Yehayyi Zina gave his daughter in marriage to Hasan Khan son of Haji Chak the daughter of Daulat Chak was married to Muhammad Makri son of Abdal Makri and the sister of Yusuf Chak son of Regi Chak - Kopwari by name was married by a *nikah* ceremony to Ghazi Khan These alliances became the cause of the strength and power of the Chaks and they in concert with one another went away to different parts of the country Ghazi Khan went to the country of Kamraj and Daulat Chak to Suiyapur The Makris went to ³ Bankal and Idi Zina remained at Srinagar in a sorrowful mood and devised plans for their destruction

As the season for egg fruits or *brinjals* now came Idi Zina ordered that fowls and *brinjals* may be brought so that they be cooked together This was a dish ⁴ much liked by the Kashmiris Then Bahram Chak and Sayid Ibrahim and Sayid Naqub came at his invitation but Yusuf Chak did not come Idi Zina had the three guests seized and imprisoned them Yusuf receiving information of this went away by way of Kamraj with three hundred horsemen and seven hundred foot soldiers and joined Daulat Chak When Idi Zina saw that the Kashmiris had united with the Chaks he released the

¹ The name is written very differently in the different MSS etc The MSS have کشتواریان and کھا واریان while the lith ed has کھتواریان Firishtah lith ed has کنوریان Col Briggs (vol IV p 503) has Kapoories and Rodgers (J A S B vol LIV p 1^o) has Kapuris I prefer Kishtwaris as it means the people of Kishtwar while the others have no meaning at all

² The name is written as کنوادی and کونواری in the MSS and کنواری in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has کنواری The name is not given either by Col Briggs or by Rodgers

³ Firishtah lith ed has ناکل and Rodgers has Pakul but the MSS and the lith ed of the Tabaqat have بانکل Bankal which is the name of a pargana in SW part of Kamraj See page 371 of the *Āin-e-Albani* (Jarratt vol II) where it is Bunkal one of the south west *parganahs*

⁴ The word is معرر in both MSS and the lith ed of the Tabaqat Firishtah lith ed has لطف و مکرر

Mughals, such as ¹Qaṣṣ Bahādur Mīrzā, ‘Abd-m-rahman Mīrzā, Khān Mirak Mīrzā, Shāhzāda Lang, Muhammad Nazī, and Sabr ‘Alī from prison, and showed favour to them, and giving each one of them a horse and ²armour and some money remained at ³Chakpūr

At this time, Sayyid ⁴Ibrāhīm and Sayyid Ya‘qūb, in concert with Jārūd, who was employed to guard them, fled, and going to Kamrāj joined Daulat Chak Bahām Chak could not escape. On the following day, Ghāzī Khān came to Sīnagar with ⁵three thousand horsemen. ‘Īdī Zīnā sent the Mughals to fight with him, but he broke down the bridges, and so the Mughals could not do anything. At this time Daulat Chak also came, and joined Ghāzī Khān in Sīnagar, and they joined together and took up a position in the ‘Īdīqāh. There were constant skirmishes between the two parties, but Bābā Khalīl went to ‘Īdī Zīnā in order to bring about a peace. He said, “You put your trust in the Mughals, and paid no regard to the Kashmīrīs. This was not right. Having said words like this he effected a peace

¹ The names are as I have them in the text in the MSS and in the lith ed., with slight differences. In the *Firishtah* lith ed some of the names are different.

² The word used is سروبا in one MS and in the lith eds of the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah* and سروبا in the other MS. I cannot find either Sirpā or Siropā in the dictionary. Rodgers has translated the word as armour, and I have adopted his translation. There is a Bengali or Hindi word *Siropā* (सिरपा) which means an article of dress, e.g., a scarf, which can be worn as a mark of distinction, for instance, in certain places of pilgrimage various different kinds of Siropās are given to the pilgrims, according to the amounts offered by them to the presiding deity of the temple. *Siropā* may also mean something covering the head and feet.

³ The name is Chakpūr in one MS and in the lith ed of *Firishtah*. In the other MS and in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* it is چک پرتو Chakpartū.

⁴ This passage with which *Firishtah* agrees word for word has been translated by Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 122) quite incorrectly as “the Sayyids Ibrāhīm and Yaqūb by the help of the troopers escaped from prison, and joined Ghāzī Chakk at Kamrāj.” The name of the officer-in charge is incorrectly given as جاردو Jārdū instead of جارود Jārūd in the text edition.

⁵ The numbers are very differently given. One MS has سی ہزار سوار. The lith ed has سی ہزار کس. In the other MS and *Firishtah* lith ed it is سی سوار, and this is followed in the text edition. I am inclined to think that three thousand was the correct number.

between him and the Kashmiris. They then sent away the Mughals with their families and dependants by way of Tibet. ¹ Khanamji the sister of Mirza Haidar went away to Kabul by way of ² Pakli. The people of Tibet slew ³ Sabr Ali and the other Mughals and Khanamji reached Kashhar.

Following these events news came that Hubat Khan and ⁴ Saiyid Khan and Shahbaz Khan Afghans who were of the Niyazi tribe were coming to conquer Kashmir and had arrived in the *pargana* of ⁵ Banihal and have entered the hills of ⁶ Lunkot. Idi Zina Hasan Makri Bahram Chak Daulat Chak and Yusuf Chak combined together and marched out to fight the Niyazis. The two parties confronted each other and fought bravely. ⁷ Bibi Rabea the wife of Haidar Khan also fought manfully and struck Ali Chak with her sword. In the end Haibat Khan and Saiyid Khan and Firuz Khan and Bibi Rabea were slain and the Kashmiris returned to Srinagar with triumph and victory. They sent the heads of the Niyazis by the hand of Yaqub Mir to Islam Khan in the village of Ban which is near the river Chinab.

¹ The name is حانم حى in one MS and حانم in the other MS and in the lith eds of the Tabaqat and Firishtah. It will be seen from page 718 and note 5 that in the account of the events which happened immediately after Mirza Haidar's death his widow was called Khanam in the Tabaqat but the sister's name was not mentioned but Firishtah lith ed called the widow Khanm and the sister Khanji. I have therefore called the sister Khanamji following the MS which gives her that name. It is حانمى in the text edition.

The name in the text edition is بکلی Bakli. Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 123) has Pagli.

³ The name looks like صبر علی in one MS and حر علی in the other and مر علی in the lith ed. The name is Sabr Ali in earlier passages.

⁴ Firishtah lith ed has سعد حان but later on he calls him سند حان.

⁵ Firishtah also has Banihal but Rodgers has Banihal. There is a *pargana* called Banihal to the S E of Srinagar (see *Amir Akbari* Jarratt vol II p 369).

⁶ The MSS and the lith ed have در کوه لون کوب. Firishtah lith ed has در کوه لون. I cannot find anything about کوه لون کوب or کوه لون. Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 13) has at the salt range but I do not know his authority for saying so. Of course it may be the Salt Range which runs parallel to the Jhelum near Pind Dadan Khan.

⁷ Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 123) calls her Bibi Raba.

After that, hostilities again commenced among the Kashmīrīs, and 'Īdī Zīnā, in concert with Fath Chak, ¹ Lōhar Mākri, Yūsuf Chak, Bahām Chak, and Ibrāhīm Chak came to ² Khālidgarh, and took up residence there, and Daulat Chak, Ghāzī Khān, Husam Mākri and Sayyid Ibrāhīm Khān and a band of ³ *Dūms* joining together, took up their quarters in the 'Īdgāh. When a period of two months had passed in this way, Yūsuf Chak, Fath Chak, ⁴ Lōhar Mākri son of Sahu, and Ibrāhīm Chak separated themselves from 'Īdī Zīnā and joined Daulat Chak. Then Daulat Chak mounted with a large force advanced against 'Īdī Zīnā, and he being unable to meet them fled without fighting, and went to the village of ⁵ Jharō. About this time he wanted to mount a horse, but by accident the horse kicked him on the chest, and he concealed himself in the village of ⁶ Samnāk, and he passed away from the world on account of the pain of the accident. They brought his body to Srīnagar, and buried it in

¹ The name is Kohrād Mākri in one MS, but two lines further down it is Lōhar Dānkri and is Kōhar Dānkri and Lōhar Dānkri in the other and in the lith ed. In Firishtah it is Kōhar Mākri. I have accepted Lōhar Mākri.

² The name is خالد کر Khāldkar and خالد کره Khāldkarah in the MS, and جلاکار Jālakar in the lith ed. In the lith ed of Firishtah it is Khālidgarh, but Rodgers has Khāgarh.

³ The MSS have طایفه دو مان, and the lith ed of Firishtah has what also looks like طایفه دو مالا. The lith ed of the Tabaqāt has دو نان. I do not know what the طایفه دو مان would mean. دون of course means base, vulgar, etc. and طایفه دو نان may mean a group of the common people. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 123) translates طایفه دو مان یکجا شد as "joining themselves together."

⁴ See note 1 above. After لوعر دانگری words like ولنه هیو and ولسه بهو occur in the MSS. The lith ed has ولد سهو. Firishtah lith ed has no corresponding words. I have adopted the reading of the lith ed. The text edition has ولنه هیو.

⁵ The name is مرو, and مرو in the MSS., and مرو in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has مرو or it may be مرو, and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV, p 123) has Merv. I cannot decide between these various readings, but I certainly do not consider that Merv is the correct reading. In the text edition it is مرو.

⁶ The name is سیماک in the MSS and the lith ed has سیماک, but Rodgers has Simāle.

the ¹mausoleum of Musa Zina The *amirs* then rebelled and excusing Nazuk Shah who had nothing of the government except a name from that also determined on ruling themselves

(Nazuk Shah) ruled nominally for ³two months for the second time after (the death of) Mirza Haidar

⁴AN ACCOUNT OF IBRĀHĪM SHĀH SON OF MUHAMMAD SHĀH
WHO WAS THE BROTHER OF NĀZUK SHĀH

As Idī Zina had passed away Daulat Chak became the *Madar ul mulk* and took up the management of affairs into his own hand But when he saw that there was no escape from having someone who should bear the name of Sultan he raised Ibrahim Shah to the seat of government and kept him as a puppet At this time Khwajah Hayi the *takil* of Mirza Haidar came out of the ⁵jungle and went to Islam Khan ⁶And seizing Shams Zina and Bahram Chak put them into the prison When the day of the *Īd i fitr* came Daulat

¹ Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 193) translates در مزار موسی ربا as in the village of Musa Zina

The MSS are incorrect One has ارادة خود کردند and the other ارادة خود کرددی I have adopted the reading in the lith ed which is correct and which is also the reading in the lith ed of Firsihtah

³ The MSS and the lith ed have for the second time Firsihtah lith ed has for the third time Firsihtah lith ed and Col Briggs have two months but Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India have ten months

⁴ That is the heading in the MS as well as in the lith ed Firsihtah however calls Ibrahim Shah the son of Nazuk Shah Col Briggs calls him brother of Nazuk Shah on one page and his son in the next page Rodgers and the Cambridge History of India page 989 say that he was a son of Nazuk Shah

⁵ It is جنگل jungle in the MSS and the lith ed of the Tabaqat and Firsihtah but Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 123) has Khaigal and he translates در بستان اسلام شاه as took refuge with Islam Shah

⁶ This is the reading in the MSS and also in the lith ed The sentence has no nominative and the verb کردند is in the plural Firsihtah lith ed has در بستان عیدی ربا then as in the Tabaqat which makes matters if anything worse for the two defects pointed out remain there is the additional difficulty that Id Zina was dead I think the nominative should be Daulat Chak and the verb should be in the singular Rodgers tides over the difficulty by saying that Shams Zina and Bahram Chakk were thrown into prison but he does not say by whom

Chak having put his troops in order, came to the foot of the ¹ Qabq (to practise archery) Yūsuf Chak also rode out to the foot of the Qabq The runner or footman, who was collecting the arrows, came among the horse's legs ² The horse got entangled, and Yūsuf Chak fell from his horse, and his neck was broken

In the year 960 A H hostility took place between Ghāzī Khān and Daulat Chak and there was very great dissension among the Kashmīrīs Husain Mākri and Shams Zīnā, who were in Hindūstān, came back, and in the year 961 A H, joined Ghāzī Khān ³ The sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak went to Daulat Chak These disputes and dissensions continued for two months, but at length a husbandman, ⁴ in a spirit of impertinent interference, came to Daulat Chak, and said in his ears, "Ghāzī Khān has sent me to you to enquire why you have collected these unprincipled ⁵ men round you, as they are all your enemies" In the same way, he went to Ghāzī Khān,

. ¹ The word is *فبق* in one MS It looks like *فبق* in one place and like *صبق* in another in the second, and it is *فبق* Fabq in both places in the 4th ed In the lith ed of Firishtah it is *فایوق* in both places Whatever the correct word is it seems to be the name of a hillock near Srinagar Rodgers's translation (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 123) is "outside the city"

² The words are *اسب بندرة شد* in one MS and the lith ed, and *اسب بندرة شد* in the other MS Firishtah lith ed has no corresponding words In the text-edition the reading *اسب تند شد* has been adopted

³ Both MSS and the lith ed have Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak, but Yūsuf Chak had broken his neck, and Firishtah lith ed has the sons of Yūsuf Chak, so I have inserted the word sons before Yūsuf Chak in the translation The text-edition has followed the manuscripts

⁴ The words are *بعضوان فضول* which Rodgers has translated "assuming the garb of an ambassador" The meaning is somewhat doubtful, but I think my translation is correct The second word is *فصولی* in one MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah, but it is *فضول* in the other MS In the lith ed of the Tabaqāt the words from *واين اختلاف* to *گفت* are omitted, and in their place the words are *و در گوئی او گفتند*, according to which the meaning would be that it was the sons of Yūsuf Chak and Bahrām Chak who spoke the words in Daulat Chak's ear

⁵ There is an adjective *بی تقریب* to the noun *مردم* in both the Tabaqāt and in Firishtah Rodgers has omitted translating it I think my translation is correct

and said Daulat Chak intends to be at peace with you Why are you quarrelling with him Having said things like this he effected a settlement between them Shams Zina then fled and went to Hindustan

At this time some Tibetans came and drove away the flocks of sheep of *parganas* ¹ Khawah and Barah which were allotted as the *jagir* of Habib Chak brother of Nasrat Khan Daulat Chak sent Ibrahim Chak Haidar Chak son of Ghazi Khan and other chief men with a large army by way of Lar to invade great Tibet Habib Khan himself advanced with great rapidity in pursuit of the Tibetans by the road by which the flocks had been driven away He suddenly came up to a fort of the Tibetans fought with the garrison and slew their commander by the sword The rest all fled Habib Khan encamped there and said to Darvish Chak his brother Do you mount with the troops and get into Tibet Darvish Chak was negligent and did not comply with his words Habib Chak in spite of his ² wounds which were still bleeding mounted and got into the edifices and great mansions of Tibet The Tibetans being unable to oppose him fled without attempting to fight Forty of the men who were clinging to the roof of one of the palaces were seized They made much importunities and begged that they might not be killed They also promised to give five hundred horses one thousand ³ pieces of *pattu* (woollen cloth) fifty yaks and two hundred *tolas* of gold Habib Chak paid no attention to their words and hanged them all He mounted and rode to another fort and destroyed it also The Tibetans sent three thousand horsemen five hundred pieces of *pattu* one hundred sheep and thirty yaks for his acceptance He also

¹ The name of the *parganas* are as I have them in the text in one MS in the other they are *دکھا و دارة* and in the lith ed *کهاؤ و ناره* Firishtah lith ed has *دو ناره کها* and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 194) has Khawan and Bara I think however that the flocks were taken away only from one *pargana* that of Khawarparah which is one of the *parganahs* to the NE of Śrinagar (see *Āin-e-Akbari* Jarratt vol II p 369)

² One MS insert between *رحمها* and *حون مرگ* the phrase *که حورده بود* وارو

³ The word is *نارحه* a segment a piece Rodgers has pieces

took from the Tibetans some ¹ good horses of Kāshghar, which had come into their hands

Hardai Chak, son of Ghāzī Khān, sent ² Sūkhāī, his foster brother, to Habīb Chak (with the message) "The Tibetans had kept these horses for Ghāzī Khān, and it would be better that you should send them, that I may send them to him" ³ Habīb Chak had Sūkhāī struck about two hundred times with a stick, and said, "What power does Ghāzī Khān possess that he should take these horses, which I have seized by the force of my sword" They wanted to fight about these horses, but men intervened to effect a settlement, and did not allow them to fight After that they came to Srinagar, and passed the winter there

In the year 962 A H, there was a great earthquake in Kashmīr, and many villages and towns were destroyed The villages of ⁴ Jhalū and Dāmpūr, with buildings and ⁵ trees, were removed from one bank of the *Bihat* (Jhelum) to the opposite bank, and in the village of Mārwarah which is situated at the foot of a hill, owing to a landslip (*lit* falling of the hill) ⁶ about sixty thousand people perished

¹ Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 124) translates ادبایں حرب کاشغر "some five Kāshgarī horses", apparently here five is a misprint for fine

² The name is سوکھائی in the MSS and سرکھائی in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed has Khānī, Rodgers also has Khānī Col Briggs (vol IV, p 506) does not mention the name, and his translation of the passage is quite incorrect

³ Firishtah lith ed has a totally different account of what happened, but it appears to me less natural than that in the text

⁴ One MS has دامپور, the other has دامپور The lith ed has حلو و دامپور Firishtah lith ed has نیلو و آدم پور Col Briggs (vol IV, p 506) does not mention the first, but calls the other Dampoor Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 124) has Nilū and 'Adampūr

⁵ Firishtah agrees Col Briggs (vol IV, p 506) says the town was removed from the east to the west bank of the Behut river, and in a footnote he adds that it is not easy to say whether the text should be taken literally Rodgers says that the villages were "washed away" Dāmpor, with a spring, is mentioned by Stein دوام نور in the text edition is apparently a mistake The earthquake is mentioned by Piājyabhatta (lines 513 to 521) There is no mention of the removal of Jhalū and Dāmpūr from one bank of the Bihat, but it is said हसैनपुरहोसैनपुरयोर्दूरवर्तिन । नदीसुखङ्ग । भूकम्पे युक्त्रभोज्यापि दृश्यते । (l 517)

⁶ The words are distinctly هرات مقدار شصت in the MSS as well as in the lith ed Firishtah, however, has س شص six hundred, and this is more probable

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF ISMA'IL SHĀH BROTHER OF IBRĀHĪM SHĀH

When five months had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Ibrāhīm Shah which was in reality the rule of Daulat Chāk the times became propitious for Ghazī Khan and ° Daulat Chāk was slain Ghazī Khan became fully independent but for name's sake raised Isma'īl Shāh to the throne in the year 963 A.H. In this year Habib Chāk wanted to join Daulat Chāk (it would appear that what was said about his being slain or defeated and blinded as in Firishtah was said in anticipation of a coming event) and with this determination he went towards ³ Marda Dun Ghazī Khan said to Nasrat Chāk

Your brother Habib has joined Daulat Chāk It is right that before he arrives we should seize Daulat Chāk for after his arrival the matter

¹ That is the heading in one MS in which however the name is اسماعیل instead of علي. In the other MS and the lith ed the words بن علي شاه are added after Ibrāhīm Shah but it does not appear who 'Alī Shah was Ibrāhīm Shah according to the Tabaqat was a son of Muhammad Shah and according to Firishtah a son of Nazuk Shah (see p. 79 and note 4)

² The MSS and the lith ed all say دولت حاک بعل رسد Firishtah however says Daulat Chāk مغلوب و مکحول گردید i.e. was defeated and fettered Prayabhatta's *Rajataranginī* has a curious story (see lines 523-530) It says दोलतचक्र (the change from Cakra to Cakka should be noted) attempted to stop the flow of water in the वेतालाइनमूनि Thrown by the angry Vetilas (some kind of supernatural beings) stones fell into his house He then went to a महात्म्य साधु known as अभिमन्यु who lived in a village called Tulamula and inquired of him how the dominions could be rich and free from all fears The Sadhu said महात्म्या वार्षिकं ब्रह्मचर निवारय When Daulat Chāk inquired how he could do such a thing the Sadhu became दीपब्राह्मणमन्त्र and he cursed Daulat Chāk The curse also was curious चन्द्रमध्यमाद्य चन्द्रार्कौ ते पतियन्त that is the moon and sun will fall on your reaching the middle of the sea After दशमेमासिधर्मभूत (i.e. I suppose Ibrāhīm Shah) had reigned for one month Ghazī Khan himself in his avarice took his position (अप्राप्य तत् पद सोमनाथखानसन्तत खय)

I have included this long quotation as it appears to me to show a great increase of superstition and a great deterioration in the historical sense of the chronicler

³ The name is written as مرداروں and مرار دول in the MSS and مردادوں in the lith ed Firishtah lith ed also has مردادوں I have retained the reading in the lith ed while the text edition has مردادوں

would be difficult" ¹ It so happened that Daulat Chak had got into a boat, and had gone to the Dal reservoir (lake) to shoot ducks. When he got out of the boat, Ghāzī Khān coming up seized his horses, and he fled and got on the ² Jāk hill. Ghāzī Khān pursued and seized him. Habīb Chak arriving at ³ Nūr, knew that Daulat Chak had been seized, and became distressed in his mind. Ghāzī Khān caused Daulat Chak to be blinded.

After that Habīb Chak came, and saw Ghāzī Khān. The latter was not pleased with him. He sent for Nāzūk Chak, nephew (brother's son) of Daulat Chak, and ⁴ wanted to give him the trouble of becoming his *valīl*, but he did not agree owing to the anger he felt at his uncle having been blinded, and Ghāzī Khān wanted to seize and imprison him, but he being warned fled, and went to Habīb Chak.

AN ACCOUNT OF HABĪB SHĀH, SON OF ISMA'IL SHĀH

When two years had elapsed from (the beginning of) the rule of Isma'il, he died, and Ghāzī Khān raised his son to the government. At the end of the year 964 A H, Nasīrat Chak, Habīb Chak, Nāzūk Chak, Sankar Chak brother of Ghāzī Khān, and Yūsuf and Hastī Khān all collected together, entered into an agreement, and determined to the following effect: "Today Ghāzī Khān has taken a ⁵ medicine, his brother Husain Chak is in prison. We will bring the

¹ Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 125) translates ناگه "Once upon a time", and بحوض دل "to a pond in the lake". For a description of the Dal lake, see Stein's *Rājataranginī*, vol. II, page 416, and page 417 for its islands and shores.

² The name is حاک in one MS. In the other it is not decipherable. In the lith. ed. it is حاک. Firsihtah lith. ed. does not give the name. The text-edition following the lith. ed. has کوه حاک.

³ The name is نیر, and نهر in the MSS., and منیر in the lith. ed. Firsihtah does not give the name of the place.

⁴ The words are وکالت ناو نمود in the MSS. as well as in the lith. eds. of the *Tabaqāt* and of Firsihtah, the meaning of which is not quite clear. Rodgers's translation (*J A S B*, vol. LIV, p. 125) is "gave Nāzūk Chakk the nephew of Daulat Chakk much inconvenience and trouble."

⁵ The word in the MSS. as well as in the lith. ed. are داروی کار حورده است. I cannot find any meaning of the word کار which would suit the context. Firsihtah lith. ed. has got the same words, but the word کار is omitted. Rodgers

latter out of prison and kill Ghazī Khan. This news reached Ghazī Khan. He won over Yusuf Chak and Sankar Chak and summoned them to his presence. Habib Chak, Nasrat Chak and Darvish Chak declared that they would either go (to Ghazī Khan?) or would make their escape after engagements and promises have been made in the presence of Qadis and learned men. Nasrat Chak went to Ghazī Khan without any engagements and was thrown into prison. Habib Chak in concert with Nazuk Chak broke down the bridges and rose in rebellion. Hasti Khan came with a large force and joined them. Ghazī Khan sent a large army to attack them and a great battle took place. Ghazī Khan's army was however defeated and some of his men were taken prisoners. Habib Chak having gained the victory went to ¹Mamun. After his men had been defeated Ghazī Khan himself rode out to attack Habib Chak. He went to Dumrah and having got hold of three or four boats crossed the river.

He had three elephants and three thousand men with him. When he arrived at the plain of Khalidgarh Habib Chak came forward with ²two thousand men and engaged him in battle. After much fighting Habib Chak got into the ³Jamyah river and his horse could not cross it. Hasti Tariq one of the servants of Ghazī Khan coming after

(J A S B vol LIV p 125) has translated the words "was eaten up by physic" which cannot be understood.

¹ The word is مامون and ناسول in the MS and ناسی in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has کوه مامون and Col Briggs (vol IV p 509) has Hamoon and Rodgers has mountains of Mamun. I cannot find anything about any of these places and have adopted Mamun. The text edition, following the lith ed has ناسی.

² There are different readings here. One MS has در دومره رفته the other has در دو مریده رفته while the lith ed has در مریده رفته. Firishtah lith ed has در دومره رفته. Col Briggs (vol IV p 509) has marched on to Domra and Rodgers (J A S B vol LIV p 125) has went to Badumara which is certainly incorrect as he has prefixed the preposition *Ba* to Dumrah and has made one word of them. I have adopted Dumra though I have failed to find its location. In the text edition it is در مریده apparently a misprint for دومره.

³ The MSS as well as the lith ed have بیست کس twenty men but this is apparently incorrect. Firishtah has بیست صد twenty hundred and I have inserted hundred after twenty but the text edition has followed the MSS.

⁴ The name is جبهه and جبهه in the MSS and جانبک in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has بل ~ Col Briggs (vol IV p 509) has the

him, put his hand on his mouth, and brought him down. About that (time) Ghāzī Khān's elephant came there and he was seized. Ghāzī Khān ordered his *filbān* to cut off his head. When the *filbān* put his hand on Habib Chak's face (or into his mouth), the latter caught his fingers firmly and bit them. In the end his head¹ was severed from his body, and was taken to² Kalahmāt, where his house was, and hung there from the gallows. Ghāzī Khān also seized Darvish Chak and Nāzuk Chak, and had them hanged. After some time, Bahrām Chak came from Hindūstān to Ghāzī Khān, and the *pargana* of³ Kahuna-hāmū was allotted as his *jāgūn*. He received permission to leave Srīnagar, and went to⁴ Madanjah, in *pargana* Zaingar, which was his Muchbul", and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 125) has "at the bridge of Jamja "

Rodgers's translation (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 125) of Firishtah's version "he was compelled to flee. At the bridge of Jamja his horse stuck fast", is not correct. The correct translation would be "his horse stuck fast in the river of the Jamja bridge". Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* is rather difficult to follow in the later portions, but I think the following words refer to this incident नदौसुखङ्गु भूपालो युद्धं कृत्वा महानर । सितानदीप्रवाहेषु हमेचक्रमसारथत् । (lines 551-52). It will be noticed that Ghāzī Khān is already described as Bhūpāla or king, and Habib Chak is transformed into Habhe Cakka and not Cakra. I hoped to be able to fix the locality by finding out something about the Sitā Nadī, but this has not been possible.

¹ The words سر اورا اترن جدا کر دد occur in only one MS, but not in the other or in the lith ed, but as this was necessary before it could be sent to the place of his residence, and as Firishtah has سر اورا جدا کرده, I have inserted them.

² The name is کلہ باب in one MS and کلہ بان in the other, کلہ باب in the lith ed and کلہ نامت in Firishtah lith ed. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 509) has Kulanamut, and Rodgers has only Kala thinking that the latter part of the name in Firishtah which is نامت means the name. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol IV, p 126) translates the words بردار کشیدند which follow immediately afterwards, "hung it there on the door".

³ The name is کہوٹہ نامو in both MSS, and کہوٹہ ہا in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has کہوٹہ ہامون. Col Briggs has Kohtahamoon, and Rodgers has Khuba or Khoba Hāmūn. The nearest I can get to these in the list of *pargana*hs in *Āīn-i-Alkbarī* (Jarratt, vol II, p 370) is Khoihāma, in the NW part of the Kamrāj tract. The text edition has followed the MSS.

⁴ The name is ممدک and امدمک in the MS, and ممدک in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah. ممدک has been adopted in the text edition.

birth place Then Sankar Chak and Fath Chak and others went to Bahram and they all came together to *pargana* Suyapur and began to create disturbances Ghazi Khan sent his son and brothers to attack them They were unable to meet them and fled towards the hills On the next day Chazi Khan went in pursuit of them and when he arrived in the village of Madanjah he selected two thousand men whom he sent in pursuit of them so that they might capture them The next day news came that Bahram ¹ having been hit by an arrow had gone away to some (unknown) place and Sankar Chak and Fath Chak had separated from him Ghazi Khan went with great rapidity to ² Kahunhamu and for six days made great search to capture Bahram Ahmad Jaurin ³ brother of Haidar Chak son of Chazi Khan was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahram Ghazi Khan himself returned to the city Ahmad Jaurin went to Sherkot which was the abode of the ⁴ *Rishis* i.e. Sufis and

¹ There are different readings and the meaning is not quite clear The MSS have *بهرام* *حورده* *بحاری* (or *نبری*) The lith ed has *هوب* instead of *نر* or *نری* Firishtah lith ed has *بهرام* *ارسرکوب* *دنه* Col Briggs gives no translation of the passage Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 1-6) has Bahram Chakk had escaped from Sarkob taking Sarkob to be the name of a place which I do not think is correct It will be seen that a few lines further down the place is called Sh rkot in the Tabaqat though it is called Sarkob there also in Firishtah Sherkot is apparently the correct name of the place

² See page 73 and note 3

³ The MSS as well as the lith eds of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah all say *برادر حیدر حک ولد عاری حای* I do not know why Ahmad Jaurin could not be called son of Ghazi Khan instead of being called the brother of his son Col Briggs (vol IV p 509) has Ahmud Hoorein a son of Heidur Chuk brother of Ghazy Khan This is probably correct The words brother and son have become transposed

⁴ The name is written *رسل* in the MSS and the lith ed of the Tabaqat Firishtah lith ed has *رسل* I think the latter to be the more correct form Col Briggs calls (vol IV p 509) them *Russies* and he thinks they were the inhabitants of a conv nt of Russian missionaries being in Thibet for he argues the philosophical and horticultural Russians can be no other though their being there is a very extraordinary fact Rodgers simply calls them *Rishis* or *Sufis* I have no doubt also that they were some kind of Sufis of whom there were apparently many sects in Kashmir (see *Tarikh i Rashidi* p 436) Mirza Haidar paints them in very dark colours but some of them might have been peaceful rustics as those mentioned here are described to have been

seized them, and in order to make them produce Bahām had them bastinadoed. The *Rishīs* said "We took Bahām in a boat to the village of ¹ Bādhal to the house of Amīr Zinā." The *Rishīs* are a community or a group of people, who always carry on agriculture and plant orchards, and ² they live in a society by themselves and do not marry. ³ Ahmad Jaurīn went to Amīr Zinā, and after much search, got hold of Bahrām Chak, and took him to Sīnagar. He was there hanged by the neck, and Ahmad Jaurīn received the title of Fath Kḥān.

⁴ At this time, Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, who was in the custody of the Khakais, came with fetters on his feet mounted on the back of Yūsuf Kashmīrī. When he arrived at Rājaurī, a band of Mughals collected round him. The blind Daulat Chak and Fath Chak and other Chaks and Lōhais and Ankrīs all came to him, and in the year 965 A.H., they advanced towards Kashmīr. When they arrived at Bārāmūla, Muhammad Haidar and Fath Kḥān, who guarded the road,

¹ The name of the village is بادهل in both MSS, and نادیل in the lith ed of the *Ṭabaqāt*. In the lith ed of *Firishtah* it is نادیلی. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 510) has Nadily and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 126) Bādelī.

² I am not sure whether my translation is correct. The words in the *Ṭabaqāt* MS and lith ed are اتعلق فرمایند و دستبرد گدراوند. The lith ed of *Firishtah* has گدراوند instead of کنند.

³ The text in the *Ṭabaqāt* (MSS and lith ed) حوریں امہ رینا رمنہ is imperfect here. I have inserted Ahmad before Jaurīn, and have put in برد امیر رینا instead of امہ رینا. In the text-edition it is حورین برد ایہ رفانہ.

⁴ Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*, which is very meagre and very incorrect in its later pages, has some account of Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī's invasion immediately after the mention of the death or slaying of Habib Chak in lines 551-52 (see note 4, pp 731-32). It says गते वज्रविधे काले नोस्मीचक्रप्रचोदित । आययौ सुगुप्तस्वामो त्रीकश्मीरजिगीषया । शह अब्दोलमालीति नाम यस्यभिवद्भवि । (lines 552-53). It is curious that Shāh Abul Ma'ālī should be called the Lord of the Mughals, when he was fleeing from them. I cannot identify Nosmī Cakka. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, describes the raid of Shah Abul Ma'ālī, as "the serious rebellion of Yūsuf Chakk who was supported by Shāh Ab-'l-Ma'ālī." This does not appear to me to be correct. No Yūsuf Chak is mentioned in connection with the reign, except one, who is said to have carried Shāh Abu-ul Ma'ālī on his back. If Yūsuf Chak should be identified with the Nosmī Cakka referred to in the early part of the note, there will be some foundation for the statement.

fled and went to the village of Budukhi. Shah Abu ul ma'ali having adopted the path of justice none of his soldiers had any power to oppress the *raiyats*. When he arrived in the village of ¹ Barbakhi which is near Pattana he encamped on high ground. Chuzi Khan also marched out from Srinagar and encamped in Pattana in front of Shah Abu ul ma'ali. He made his brother named Husain the commander of his vanguard and stationed himself in ² mauda Khod. The Kashmiris who were with Shah Abu ul ma'ali attacked without his permission the army of Husain Khan and compelled him to turn back. Chuzi Khan coming to his aid fought with great gallantry and having slain many of the Kashmiris defeated Shah Abu ul ma'ali. The latter seeing the state of things without fighting turned his face to flight. When his horse became exhausted on the way a Mughal came to him and gave him his own horse which was fresh and strong. He then took hold of the exhausted horse and stood on the spot and kept back all the Kashmiris who were going in pursuit of Shah Abu ul ma'ali. When his quiver became empty the Kashmiris advanced on him in a crowd and slew him. During this time Shah Abu ul ma'ali managed to make his escape. Chuzi Khan then turned back and went to Pattana. He ordered every Mughal who was brought before him to be beheaded except Hafi (one who has memorised the *Quran*) Habshi one of the readers of His

¹ The name of the village is ماركله and مارنله in the MSS and ماركله in the lith ed of the *Tabaqat*. In the lith ed of *Irishtah* it is مارنله. The text edition following the first MS has ماركله.

² Pattana or Pitan is on the side of the ancient Samkarapura and lies on the direct road between Srinagar and Baramulla. According to *Irishtah* (I 500) पतिहासपुराजिक where I think Chuzi Khan is referred to in the words च भूपाल. I cannot find out the distance between Parihasapura and Pattana but seeing that Samkaravarman is said to have carried off whatever was of value in Parihasapura in order to raise the fame of his own town of Samkarapura where Pattana now stands (*vide* Stein's *Rajatarangini* vol II p 481) it could not have been very great. In the text-edition the name of the village is given as पति.

³ The name in both MSS is केश. The lith ed says incorrectly اسناد. *Irishtah* lith ed has केश. Col Briggs (vol IV p 510) has Gahwar and Rodgers (*J I S B* vol LIV p 106) has Khanud. In the text edition the reading in the MSS has been followed.

Majesty Jinnat Ashiānī, whom he did not slay on account of the beauty of his recitation

After this victory (Ghāzī Khān) released Nasiat Chak out of prison, and sent him to wait upon His Majesty, the asylum of the *Khīlāfat* (Akbar) Nasiat Chak went, and saw the Khān Khanān Bahām Khān, and the latter showed him all honour and respect

In the year 966 A H, there was a change in the disposition of Ghāzī Khān, and ¹he began to act with tyranny and oppression, and the people showed great detestation of him At this time a report was conveyed to his ears, that his son, in concert with some people, wanted to seize the kingdom Ghāzī Khān summoned ²Muhammad Sadūr, who was his *vakīl* (representative or agent), and Bahādur Bhat, and said, "People say this" They said, "What they say is true" Ghāzī Khān told them, "Give him good advice, so that he may not again allow such a thought to enter his mind" Muhammad Sadūr called Haidar Chak to his house, and reasoned with him, and abused him Haidar Chak got into a rage, and forcibly took the dagger from Muhammad's belt, and struck it in his stomach and killed him on the spot Men came in a crowd, and seized Haidar, and Ghāzī Khān gave the order for slaying him In the end he was executed and his head was taken to Zaingarh, and there hung from

¹ Instances of his barbarity and cruelty are given in lines 558, etc of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī* Among these is mentioned the slaying of his son named Haidar, but the circumstances surrounding the incidents are somewhat difficult to understand It is said in line 560 भातुल स्व जिघांसन्त यौवनस्य प्रतापिन । चण्डाज्जघान भूपाल स्वपुत्र द्वेदराभिध ॥ This can only be explained on the supposition that ११०० or ११०१ (see the next note) was the maternal uncle of Haidar Prājyabhatta goes on to say that there was a great wail of lamentation on the execution of Haidar (दुरात्मना । इत' पुत्रोऽप्यनेनेति हाहाकारो महानभूत् । 1 561), which shows that the people were in sympathy with the son or at least were grieved over his death, and were hostile to Ghāzī Khān, and it is also said अष्टादशभक्तस्य युवराजस्य मन्त्रिण । सुताज्जघान भूपाल उन्मत्त इव राक्षस । (1 562) which means that Ghāzī Khān like a mad Rāksasa had the eighteen councillors of the prince executed I cannot understand the word सुतान् in this line It may be a printer's mistake for स तान् The description of Ghāzī Khān as a mad Rāksasa shows the intensity of the popular hatred towards him

² The name is Muhammad Ṣadūr in one MS and in the lith ed. In the other MS it is Muhammad Ṣadū The name is Muhammad Junaid in Firishta

a gibbet Ghāzī Khan also had the men who had conspired with him (Haidar) put to death

In the year 967 A H Qarrā Bahadur came from Hindustan with a large army and nine elephants and he had with him ¹ Nasrat Chak and Fath Chak and others from among the Kashmiris and also a large body of Khakars He waited for three months at Lalipur He had great hopes that the Kashmiris would join him but at this time Nasrat Khan and Fath Chak and Lohari and Ankri fled from him and went to Ghāzī Khan Owing to this great weakness crept into Qarrā Bahadur's army Ghāzī Khan came out of Kashmir and arrived in Naurōzkot (He) sent some foot soldiers against him and defeated him Qarrā Bahadur fled and got into the fort of Dayarah The following day he fled from the foot soldiers and his elephants fell into the hands of the Kashmiris and five hundred Mughals were put to death

When a period of five years of the rule of Habib Shah had passed Ghāzī Khan concealed him in a corner raised the standard of his own rule did not allow even the name of sovereignty to another and had the public prayers read and the coins struck in his own name and gave himself the title of Ghāzī Shah

³ AN ACCOUNT OF THE RULE OF GHĀZĪ KHĀN

Ghāzī Khan having ascended the throne according to the custom of the rulers of Kashmir commenced giving himself the titles of *Badshah* and *Sultan* Owing to ⁴ leprosy with which he had before this been afflicted his voice at this time underwent a change and his

¹ The name is Nasrat Khan in Chal in one MS It is omitted in the other In the lith ed both of the *Ṭabaqāt* and of *Ḥishtah* it is Nasrat Chak

The name is Lalipur in the MS as well as the lith ed of the *Ṭabaqāt* It is Lalajur in the lith ed of *Ḥishtah*

³ The heading is as I have it in the text edition in both MSS and the lith ed *Ḥishtah* has *دکړ حکومت عاری ساه* which is better

⁴ The attack of leprosy and the death of Ghāzī Khan or Shah are described in Prayabhatṭa's *Rajataranginī* lines 563-567 It however omits all the incidents which are mentioned in the *Ṭabaqāt* and *Ḥishtah* as having occurred after his assumption of the royal title

fingers were about to drop off, and there were ulcers in his gums (*dar dandān*, i.e., in his teeth). In the year 968 A H, Fath Khān and Lōharī and Ankrī and other Kashmīrīs became suspicious of him, and fleeing got into the hilly country. Ghāzī Khān sent his brother Husain Khān with two thousand men in pursuit of them. As it was the season of snow, Husain Khān, on arrival at ¹ Baharārah, made a halt. The enemy getting warning, went to the village of ² Ahlan, and a large number of them, falling under the snow, perished. The rest, who survived, went to ³ Kishtwār, and in the year 969 A H, they were in great distress there, and sought an asylum with Husain Khān. The latter prayed to Ghāzī Khān to pardon their offences, and he pardoned them, and gave them good *jāgīrs*.

In the year 970 A H, Ghāzī Khān left Kashmīr, and took up his residence at Lāi, and sent his son Ahmad Khān in concert with Fath Khān and ⁴ Nāṣir Kiyānī and other renowned *amīns* for the conquest of Tibet. When they arrived within five *laiōhs* of Tibet, Fath Khān went into (invaded) Tibet ⁵ with the permission of Ahmad Khān, and getting among the Tibetans ⁶ came out quickly. The Tibetans

¹ The name is بحرارة, and بحرارة in the MSS, Firishtah lith ed has left out a considerable number of words from برف بود to سردار, مصالغان, and Col Briggs and Rodgers have followed it.

² The name is Ahlan in both MSS, and Aslan in the lith ed.

³ The name is كهوار in both MSS, and كتوار in the lith ed of the Tabaqāt, and كهتوار in the lith ed of Firishtah.

⁴ The name is ناصر کیانی in both MSS, and ناصر کتانی in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has ناصر کنای, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 513) transliterates as Nasir Kutaby, and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 128) has Nāsir Kibatu.

⁵ The MSS as well as the lith ed of the Tabaqāt have برخواست, i.e., with the permission, but Firishtah lith ed has برخواست, without the permission, and the subsequent incident shows that the latter reading is probably correct.

⁶ The reading in the Tabaqāt is در میان تبتیان درآمده بود بدر آمد. The penultimate word is بدر in one MS which I have adopted. In the other MS and in the lith ed it is بر. Firishtah lith ed has a different reading, it is در آمد after رفته. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 514) translates this in the words, "proceeded to the capital", and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 129) has "went into the city" without specifying what city. It is very doubtful that Fath Khān reached as far as the Capital of Tibet.

were unwilling to fight and sent much tribute ¹ At this time the idea came into Ahmad Khan's mind. Fath Khan went into Tibet and came out. If I do not do a similar deed the people of Kashmir will all praise him. Then he determined that he should go *jaridah* (alone or with a small retinue). Fath Khan said. It is not advisable that you should go and indeed if you must go go with a large force. Ahmad Khan did not listen to his words and went with only five hundred men. He left Fath Khan in the camp. When the Tibetans saw that he had such a small force they attacked him. He was unable to withstand them and fled. On coming to Fath Khan said. Today thou be the rearguard. I am off. He did not delay anywhere. When the men saw that Ahmad Khan was running away they all turned their faces in flight. Fath Khan however halted. The Tibetans came up to him. he fought single handed with them and was slain. On hearing this news Chhaji Khan got into a rage and strongly criticised his son's conduct.

² The period of Chhaji Khan's rule was four years.

¹ Firishtah agrees except in the latter part where he says *تا بروم و او هیچ بروف نکرده پس سد سنان تاو رسیده خون بها دادند جنگ بر اچند* و *دفع حال از کمال عرب تنها جنگ کرده کشته شد*. The versions both in Col. Briggs and Rodgers are altogether wrong but it would be useless to point out all their mistakes. The Cambridge History of India page 290 gives a short summary as follows. His advanced guard was defeated and instead of pressing forward to its support he fled with the main body of the force. Every statement in this sentence appears to me to be incorrect. The advanced guard was not defeated and in fact there was no advance guard and Ahmad Khan could not have pressed forward to its support. He was in fact running away the main body running away with him and it was only Fath Khan whom when he was running away Ahmad Khan implored or ordered to be the rearguard and he fought bravely and was killed. It is unfortunate that a history which is believed to be a standard work should contain such a statement. The compiler apparently read neither the *Tabaqat* nor *Firistah* and apparently not even the incorrect translations of Col. Briggs or Rodgers.

² The word *اعراض* (honours reputations) in the text edition is apparently a misprint for *اعتراض* (criticism animadversion).

³ The account of the reign of Chhaji Shah appears to end thus abruptly both in the *Tabaqat* and in *Firistah* but as a matter of fact it is continued in the earlier part of the account of the reign of Husain Khan or Shah.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF HUSAIN KHĀN, BROTHER OF GHĀZĪ KHĀN

In the year 971 A H, Ghāzī Khān left Kashmīr with the intention of conquering Tibet, and took up his quarters in ² Maukhadah Khār, but owing to an acute attack of leprosy he lost the use of his eyes, and adopted bad manners and perpetrated tyranny on the people, and extorted sums of money as fines from innocent men. The people being aggrieved at his conduct, divided themselves into two parties. One of them united with his son Ahmad Khān, and the other joined his brother Husain Khān. On hearing this, he came back to Sīnagar, and as he had more affection and kindness for Husain Khān, he raised him in his place to the *saltanat*. The *vakils* and *vazirs* of Ghāzī Khān all went to Husain Khan's house, and began to serve him. After fifteen days Ghāzī Khān divided all his equipages and rich stuffs into two portions. One share he gave to his sons, and made over the other moiety to tradesmen, and ordered that they should pay him its price. The tradesmen came to Husain Khān praying for justice. The latter forbade Ghāzī Khān (to effect the sale and demand the price). Ghāzī Khān being annoyed with him wanted to make his son his successor. Husain Khān, on being informed of this, summoned Ahmad Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, Abdāl Khān and other chief men, and took pro-

¹ The heading is as I have it in the text in both the MSS and in the lith ed. Firishtah has *ذکر سلطنت حسین شاه*, which is better. The Cambridge History of India, page 290, says that the new ruler ascended the throne as Nāsir-ud dīn Husain Shāh.

The accession of Husain Khān or Shāh is mentioned in line 575 of Prājyabhatta's *Rājataranginī*, and the following lines describe his impartial justice, his prosperity, his fame and his pleasure, in respect of which, it says *सुखं तत्सदृशं स्वर्गं स चकार न वासवः* | (l. 578), i.e., even *Indra* did not have such pleasure in *Śvarga*. The happiness of the people is described in line 583, which says *दुर्भिक्षचौरराजभ्यो भये तेन निवारिते* | *अस्मत् स्वर्गसदृशं लोकं कश्मीरमण्डलं* | i.e., famine, robberies and fear from kings having been prevented by him, the people thought Kashmir to be like *Śvarga*.

² The name is *مؤکده کهار* Maukhadah Khār in both MSS. It is Maukandah in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed. has Maulad Khār. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 514) has Mokudkar and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p. 129) has Muladghar, which is, however, not a correct transliteration of the name as given in the lith ed. of Firishtah, where the last syllable is *کهار* ghār, or may be ghār but not ghar.

mises and engagements from them that they would remain obedient to him Chizī Khan summoned and collected his own men and the Mughals Husain Khan also prepared to meet him The people and the Qadis intervened and quelled the disturbance Chizī Khan came out of the city and took up his quarters in Zainpur but after three months he came back to Srinagar Husain Khan¹ divided the country of Kashmir among men

In the year 972 A H Husain Khan granted Rājauri and Nau Shahr jagir to Sankar Chak his elder brother and sent him there Immediately after this news came that Sankar Chak had risen in revolt (Husain Khan) then allotted the jagirs to Muhammad Makri and sent a large force against Sankar Chak The commanders of the force were Ahmad Khan Fath Khan and Khwajah Masud² Nayak They went and fighting with Sankar defeated him Husain Khan advanced to welcome them and brought them to Srinagar After some time Husain Khan learnt that Ahmad Khan and Muhammad Khan Makri and Nasrat Khan had made plans for murdering him and wanted to imprison them They on learning this came to Husain Khan with a large number of followers and he was unable to harm them in any way When they left his presence³ he became anxious (knowing) that they had become acquainted with the true state of things He

¹ Similar divisions have been made by other Sultans also but the reasons of such divisions is not clear Firishtah prefaces the statement by saying حسن حک استقلال کلی بہر سادہ but I do not think it gives any sufficient reasons

There are differences in the readings One MS has سرگردان while the other and the lith ed has سرداران Then one MS has احمد حان و فتح حان while the lith ed has احمد حان و مسعود و نامک the other has احمد حان و فتح حان و مسعود نامک Firishtah lith ed has احمد حان و فتح حان و حواجہ مسعود و نامک حک I was inclined at first to adopt the reading in Firishtah but I found that the construction of the sentence in the Tabaqat is different so I have adopted the reading in the first MS though I am not quite sure about the last word In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has مسعود نامک in place of مسعود نامک in the translation above

³ The readings are slightly different One MS has مدفکر سد کہ while the other and the lith ed have مدفکر سدد I have adopted the first reading

therefore, sent ¹ Malik Lūli Laund to them, with the message, that they should all meet together, and make promises and engagements that none of them would attempt any hostility to the others. Malik Lūli Laund went and made proposals of peace. They then all came together in the house of Ahmad Khān, and agreed that they should take Ahmad Khān to the house of Husam Khān. Ahmad Khān, after much pressing consented, and went with Nasrat Khān and Malik Lūli to Husam Khān's house. Qādī Habib, who was one of the chief men of Kashmir, and Muhammad Mākī were also sent for. They all met together in the *Dīwānkhāna*, which is celebrated as the *Rang Mahal*. When night came Husam Khān said, ² "We are inclined to-night to have some *natūah-bāzī*. As the *Qādī* is puritanical, you go together to the first floor (*bālākhāna*) (and amuse yourselves), and I am also coming." When they went upstairs, "Husam Khān sent some men and had them imprisoned."

After that, he sent 'Ālam Khān and Khān Zamān, whose original name was Fath Khwājah, with a large army to attack Sankar Chak, who was near Rājaurī. They went there and defeated Sankar Chak,

¹ The name is as I have it in the text, in both MSS and in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has ملک لودنی لوند. Col Briggs does not mention the name. Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 130) has Lodnī Lond. Laund according to the dictionary means a soldier or an adventurer. It also, I think, means a Levantine, but I cannot understand how a Levantine should have made his way to Kashmir.

² The text is imperfect and contradictory. One MS has چون فاصی متشرع است شروع. The other has چون فاصی متشرع است شما با اتفاق فاصی. The lith ed has چون فاصی متشرع است. رفته صحبت دارید که من هم می آیم. The lith ed of Firishtah has the same reading as the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*, but leaves out the word *Qādī*. I consider this reading the best and have adopted it for the reason mentioned below.

I cannot find the meaning of بندوه بازی. *Bāzī* means a game or play. In a preceding note I have said that *Natūah* is probably a corruption of Sanskrit *Nata*, an actor or a mimic. As there is a reference to the *Qādī*'s being orthodox or puritanical, the *natūah bāzī* in this case was probably some kind of indecent mimicry or acting, but according to the text in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*, the *Qādī* was also invited to go to the *Bālākhāna*, where the game would be played. If the text of the lith ed of Firishtah is adopted and the word *Qādī* is omitted then there would be no difficulty.

and returned with victory and triumph Khan Zaman having acquired much credit an order was passed that all the *amirs* should go every day to his house

In the year 973 A H (people) slandered Khan Zaman to Husain Khan The latter ordered that men should not go to his house Khan Zaman wished to go away from Kashmir and was arranging to get together the things that would be required for the journey ¹Then Husain Khan went away on a hunting expedition Shams Dubar came and said to Khan Zaman Why are you going away Husain Khan is gone out for hunting and his house is unoccupied We should go there and take possession of all his equipages and treasure Khan Zaman liked these words of his and went in concert with Fath Chak and Lohar and Ankari and others like them and attacked Husain Khan's house They set fire to the door and wanted to bring out Ahmad Khan Muhammad Khan Makri and Nasrat Khan from prison Bahadur Khan son of Khan Zaman and Fath Chak then came there Masud Nayak was in charge of the prison He discharged water on the courtyard of the *Duanhuna* so that it became muddy Diulat Khan one of Husain Khan's men was

¹ One MS has by mistake *که حس سکاری آمد* The lith ed of Firishtah has *که حسن مکاری آمده بحال رمال گف*

² There are differences in the readings here One MS has *حسن حان سکار* The other MS which has the incorrect reading mentioned in the preceding note has *س سمس دو برآمده بحاله مان گف چرا بدر مبروی حسن حان نکار دوت حانه او حالسب بحاله او باد دوت* The reading in the lith ed is the same as the reading in the 2nd MS but instead of *س سمس دو برآمده* there is *سسور در نویر آمده* which appears to be incorrect I have adopted the readings in the 2nd MS though I am doubtful as to who *Shams Dubar* was In the text edition it is *مکاری آمده حسن* Besides it was not likely that because Husain Khan had gone away hunting his house should remain unoccupied Prayabhatta refers to this in line 586 The line runs *खानेजमाननामाभून्ती तस्य महीयत । स निगते महीपाले चत्कन् नगर च ॥८॥* Then there are some lines which appear to be an interpolation after which line 586 runs as *तरीयमेन्यमागत्य नाशयामास ततश्च ॥ खासिनष्टपति प्रात रत्नकारमिवाशुमान ।* These two lines (587, 588) mean that the king had a minister named Khan Zaman who when the king went out seized the city in a moment Then the king's troops came and destroyed (him) at once The king was like the morning sun which destroys the darkness

standing with his quiver on his back Bahādur Khān ran to him, and struck him with his sword. The sword fell on his quiver, and he shot an arrow into the eye of Bahādur Khān's horse, which reared up, and threw the rider. ¹ Mas'ūd Nāyak and Ankiī attacked him, and cut off his head with a dagger. Khān Zamān received information of this from outside and fled. Mas'ūd Nāyak pursued and seized him, and took him to Husain Khān. The latter ordered that he should be carried to Zaingarth, and his ears and nose and hands and feet should be cut off, and he should be hung from a gibbet. He also gave the designation of son to Mas'ūd Nāyak, and honoured him with the title of Mubārīz Khān, and allotted the ² *pargana* of Bānkāl as his *jāgīr*.

³ In the year 974 A H, Husain Khān ordered that the blinding needle to be drawn across the eyes of Ahmad Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, Naṣrat Khān and Muhammad Khān. Ghāzī Khān, on hearing this news, suffered great anguish, and as he was already ill, he passed away.

Husain Khān then founded a college, and lived in the society of pious and learned men in its precincts, and he allotted them the *pargana* of ⁴ Zampūr as their *jāgīr*.

In the year 975 A H, Lūli Laund informed Husain Khān that Mubārīz Khān says that as Husain Khān had called him his son, he

¹ These names are variously written. One MS has ت ماریک وایری, the other has مایک وایری. The lith. ed. of the *Tabaqūt* has داریک و انکری, while that of *Firishtah* has مسعود نایک و انکری. The latter appears to me to be correct and I have adopted it.

² One of the *parganas* in the S W part of Kamrāj. See page 371, *Āin-i-Albarī* (Jarratt, vol II, p. 370).

³ This is also mentioned by Prājyabhatta (l. 588) which runs विरोधे क्षतबुद्धिना वैरससक्तचेतसा । मच्छदखानकादीना चकर्ष नयनानि स । i.e., he pulled out the eyes of Muhammad Khān and others who were determined to fight with him, and whose hearts were filled with enmity towards him.

⁴ The name of the *pargana* looks like بنامور and سالور in the MSS, and as بیالپور in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is Zampūr. In the list of *pargana*hs in *Āin-i-Albarī* (Jarratt, vol II, pp. 368-371) there is none that at all resembles any of the names in the MSS or the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqūt*. There is, however, a *pargana* called Zinapur among those to the S E of Srinagar. I have, therefore, substituted the name of Zampūr, and this is followed in the text edition.

should give him a share of the treasure Husain Khan was much pained in his heart One day he went to the house of Mubariz Khan He saw many horses in his stables The pain in his mind became more acute and he ordered Mubariz Khan to be imprisoned All affairs were now entrusted to Mahil Luli But in a short time he also was imprisoned on the ground that he had embezzled ¹ forty thousand donkey loads of paddy belonging to the government and Ali Kokah was appointed in his place

In the year 976 A H Qadi Habib who was of the *Hanafi* faith coming out of the *Jama* Mosque on a Friday - had gone to the foot of Maran hull on a pilgrimage to the tomb when a ² *Rafdi* of the name of ³ Yusuf Andaz drew his sword and struck the Qadi The latter was wounded on the head Yusuf again struck him with the sword The Qadi shielded his head with his hand and his fingers were cut off Except the bigotry that was due to the difference of their religions there was nothing else between them Maulana Kamal ud din the son in law of the Qadi ⁴ who occupied himself with teaching in Sialkot was with him at the time Yusuf fled after wounding the Qadi When Husain Khan heard this news he appointed some men who found Yusuf out and brought him Husain Khan then assembled lawyers like Mulla Yusuf Mulla Firuz and others like them and ordered them that they should state whatever might be in accordance with the law (*Shara*) They replied that the execution of such a person by way of punishment was legal The Qadi said It would

¹ Col Briggs (vol IV p 17) incorrectly translates *چهل هزار حروار سالی* as forty thousand bales of shawls and Rodgers (*J A S B* vol I IV p 131) also incorrectly has 40 000 ass loads of shawls

Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 131) translates *در بنای کوه ماراں برنار* *در رفته بود* came to the ziarat in the graveyard of Nail oh Miran

² A man belonging to a section of the *Shi'a* sect who renounced their allegiance to Zaid the son of Ali the son of Husain Firishtah calls Yusuf a *Shi'a*

³ That is the name in both the MSS In the lith ed it is Yusuf Tandoz Firishtah lith ed has only Yusuf Neither Col Briggs nor Rodgers has any name In the text edition M Hidayat Hosam has adopted *یوسف اندر*

⁴ It is invidious to go on pointing out Rodgers's mistakes but he translates (*J A S B* vol LIV p 131) the clause *که در سنالکوب بدر رس اسدغال داس* *در سنالکوب بدر رس* in the words was also with him engaged in reading

not be right to execute this man, so long as I am alive " In the end, they stoned him to death Members of the sect, who were united with Yūsuf in religion and faith, said to Husain Khān, "There has been too much haste in executing him " Husain Khān said, "I acted in accordance with the verdict of the Mullās "

About this time Mīrzā Muqīm, and Ya'qūb, son of Bābā 'Alī came to Kashmīr as ambassadors from the threshold of the servants of the asylum of the *Khilāfat* When they arrived at Hīrahpūr, Husain Khān sent men to welcome them, and he himself came to the plain of ¹ Sālāh, and erected a pavilion and awnings and all the furniture of an assembly When he heard that the ambassadors had come near, he came out of the pavilion and greeted them Then they all came into the pavilion, and sat down in one place After that the ambassadors got into a boat, and Ibrāhīm Khān, the son of Husain Khān, also went with them Husain Khān did not go in the boat, but went to Kashmīr (Srinagar) on horseback He allotted the house of Husain Mākīrī to the ambassadors

After some days Mīrzā Muqīm said, "Send the *Qādī* and the *Muftīs*, according to whose decision Yūsuf was executed, to me " Husain Khān sent the *Muftīs* to him *Qādī* Zain who was of the same religion as Yūsuf said, "The *Muftīs* made a mistake in their verdict " The *Muftīs* said, "We did not give a decisive verdict for his execution We said that the execution of such a person by way of punishment was lawful " Mīrzā Muqīm insulted the *Muftīs* in the assembly, and made them over to Fath Khān *Rāfdī* and tortured them Husain Khān embarked in a boat and went away to Kamiāj Fath Khān had the *Muftīs* put to death, by order of Mīrzā Muhammad Muqīm, and had their bodies dragged round the lanes and bazārs by ropes tied to their feet Husain Khān sent his daughter with fine gifts and presents with the ambassador for the service of the asylum of the *Khilāfat* The ambassadors taking his daughter and the ² tribute with them went back to Āgra

¹ That is the name in both MSS The lith ed has in the plain of Shāhzāda Fīrishtah does not mention the name of the place

² One MS inserts *وهدایا* after *بدسکشی* and both have *رسدند* instead of *رفتند* I think *رسدند* is better and I have retained it It is *رسیدند* in the text edition

¹AN ACCOUNT OF ALI SHĀH BROTHER OF HUSAIN

In the year 977 A H news came that His Majesty the K̤halifa 1 Ilāhī had ordered Mirza Muqīm to be executed in retribution of the unjust executions which he had perpetrated in Kashmir and he had also rejected Husain K̤han's daughter. On hearing this news Husain K̤han had an attack of dysentery or bloody flux and he continued to be ill for three or four months.

At this time - Muḥammad Bhat incited Yūsuf son of Ali K̤han to rebel against Husain K̤han. When this news reached Husain K̤han he said to Yūsuf to go to his father i.e. Ali K̤han who was at ²Suyyapur and to remain there. When Yūsuf went to Ali K̤han other men also fled one after another and went to Ali K̤han. When the going of the people and also of his son to Ali K̤han became a certainty Husain K̤han sent men to Ali K̤han with this message.

What offence has been committed by me? I sent your son to you without any objection or censure. Ali K̤han said I also am not guilty in any way. People come to me fleeing from you and although I advise them it has no effect.

¹ The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS and the lith ed. The account of Husain's reign ends abruptly but some account of it is continued in that of the next reign. Prayjālatā does not mention the incident of Qadī Habib or of the arrival of Albar's ambassadors. He describes some spring and Śrī Pancamī festivities of Husain K̤han (lines 589-604) and then in lines 605-6 he says that he had अषम्रा(स्त्रा)रदोष and दोषिनः १६ गीतागो प्रलोपस्मारराज्या। दुस्विचारान्धकारिभ्यो जनो भीत्याकुलोभवत्। i.e. the Husain Shah Moon having been swallowed up by the *Raku* of epilepsy the people became frightened of the darkness of injustice. The next line describes in somewhat curious language that bestowing the kingdom on his brother the king Husain went to paradise which he had acquired by his bounty as if incited by his curiosity. The next line says he was always happy in his reign which extended to seven years.

Firishtah lith ed has incorrectly *ولد يوسف و بهت يوسف ولد* Col Briggs makes no mention of Muḥammad Bhat or Yūsuf he calls (vol IV p 50) the place where Ally K̤han was Shewpur. Rodgers (*J A S B* vol LIV p 132) translates Firishtah correctly but Bihut Yūsuf is curious. The place of Ali K̤han's residence is called Sonpur.

² One MS has Suyyapur the other has Rasulpur. The lith ed is defective and omits a part of the sentence. Firishtah lith ed has Sonpur.

In the end, 'Alī Khān advanced towards Srinagar, and encamped at a distance of seven *karōhs* from there. Malik Lūlī Laund now fled, and went to 'Alī Khān. Husain Khān came out of the city, and went to ¹ Jahlah Hājam, which was one *karōh* from it. Ahmad and Muhammad and Ankiī, who were his door-keepers and *amīns*, fled that night and went to 'Alī Khān. ² Daulat, who was one of his near relations said to Husain Khān, "As all men are running away from you, it would be better that you should send the emblems of royalty, about which there is always dispute, to 'Alī Khān. He is your brother, and is not a stranger." Husain Khān then sent the royal umbrella and the yāk-tales, and all other insignias of royalty to 'Alī Khān by the hand of his own son Yūsuf, and said, "My only offence was this that I became ill." After that 'Alī Khān came to Husain Khān's house, and enquired about his health, and they wept together.

³ Then Husain Khān made over the city to 'Alī Khān, and he came to Zampūr, and took up his residence there. 'Alī Khān assumed the title of 'Alī Shāh, and the duties of royalty devolved upon him, and ⁴ Dūkha, who was the *vakīl* of Husain Khān was put in charge of the public affairs. After three months Husain Khān departed from the world. 'Alī Khān went to meet his bier, and he was buried in the vicinity of *Harārān Bazār*.

¹ The name in one MS is *حاجم* without any dots, in the other it is *حاجم* which is probably Hahadjājam. The lith ed has *حاجم*. Firishtah lith ed has *حاجم*. Col Briggs does not mention the place. Rodgers calls it Jalahājam.

² There is no affix to the name in the MSS or in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has Daulat Chak.

³ Prājyabhatta is silent over all that happened prior to the transfer of the sovereignty, but line 600 reads *आलिखानाश्रिते राज्ये तुष्टेषु सकला प्रजाः । उदयान्निवेष्टे सूर्ये प्रातः कमलिनो यथा ।* i.e., the kingdom having devolved on 'Alī Khān, all the people were happy as in the morning the lotus (blooms) when the sun goes to the mountain of the dawn.

⁴ The name appears to be Dūkha, though there are slight variations. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 522) calls it Dookna. Rodgers does not mention the name. Dūkha meaning "sorry", "poor" is quite a humble name, and the man was apparently of humble origin.

At this time Shah Ārif *Darvish* coming from Husain ¹ Qulī Khan at Lahōre arrived in Kāshmir. Alī Khan gave him his daughter in marriage and believed him to be the *Mahdī* of the end of the world. Alī Chak son of Naurōz Chak and Ibrahim Khan son of Ghazī Khan placing great faith in him bowed in worship before him and considering him to be fit (for such honour) decided to place him on the throne. When this news reached Alī Khan's ears he became annoyed with him and wanted to injure him. Shah Ārif coming to know of this gave out that he would not remain there and that he would go to Lahōre or some other country in the course of one day and hid himself so that people might believe that he had disappeared (by some occult power). After two or three days it became known that he had paid two *ashrafis* to some boatmen and embarking in their boat had arrived at Baramula and from there had got into the mountains. Some men were sent and he was brought from there and was placed in the custody of guards. When he fled a second time he was brought back from the mountain of Mehtar Sulaiman. This time Alī Khan took from him a thousand *ashrafis* in exchange for the *mīhr* of his daughter and obtained *talaq* (divorce) for her from him and he was permitted to go away to Tibet and the two eunuchs that he had with him were separated from him and kept under surveillance.

In the year 979 A H Alī Chak son of Nauroz Chak came before Alī Khan and said 'Dukha has come into my *jagir* and has created disturbance there. If you will not forbid him I shall cut open the stomachs of my horses.' Alī Khan understood that these words were a hint that he would cut open Alī Shah's stomach. He became angry and had him seized and sent to Kamraj. He fled from there and went to Husain Qulī Khan the governor of Lahōre but as at the interview he did not perform the ceremonies which were customary his going there was of no avail and he fled from Lahore and returned to Kāshmir.

¹ The name is Husain Qulī Khan in one MS. and in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the other MS. it is Husain Khan by mistake while it is Husain Qulī Khan in the lith. ed. of the Tabaqat. Firishtah says he described himself as a descendant of Shah Jahmasp Šafī and was a *Shī'a*.

He was seized and brought to Sīnagar, and was kept in prison. After some time he escaped, and fled to Nau Shahr. 'Alī Khān sent some troops against him, and he was again seized and brought before 'Alī Khān.

In the year 980, 'Alī Khān sent an army to invade Kahtwārah (Kishtwār), and, taking the daughter of the ruler of the country, made peace with the latter, and returned.

During this time Mullā 'Ishqī and Qādī Sadī-ud-dīn came as ambassadors from the threshold of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Ilāhī. 'Alī Khān sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of the fortunate prince Sultān Salīm, with Mullā Ishqī and Qādī Sadī-ud-dīn, with other fine presents and tribute, and the public prayers and the coins of Kashmīr were adorned and embellished with the renowned name of His Majesty the Khālifa-i-Ilāhī. These events happened in the year 980 A H.

At this time Yūsuf Shāh, son of 'Alī Khān, had Ibrāhīm Khān, son of Ghāzī Khān, executed on the accusation of Muhammad Bhat, without obtaining the consent of his father, and for fear of the latter he and Muhammad Bhat fled, and went to Bāimūla. 'Alī Khān, on hearing this, was much pained in his mind. But men prayed for the pardon of Yūsuf's offence, and he was summoned, and Muhammad Bhat, who was the cause of this disturbance, was imprisoned.

In the year 982 A H, 'Alī Shāh sent an army to invade the country of Kahtwārah, which is also called Kishtwār, and taking the daughter of the ruler of that country (in marriage) for his grandson Ya'qūb made peace with him, and returned to the city.

In the year 983 A H, 'Alī Khān went with his family and dependants to see Jamalnagarī. Haider Khān, son of Muhammad Shāh, one of the descendants of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, who had been in Gujrāt, and when the servants of His Majesty went there, had waited upon him and had come to Hindūstān at his stirrups. From Hindūstān he had come to Nau Shahr. There was a cousin of his, Salīm Khān, there. A large body of men joined him (i.e., Haider Khān). 'Alī Khān sent a large body of troops with Lōhar Chak to remain at Rājaurī. Muhammad Khān Chak, who was at Rājaurī, was jealous of Lōhar Chak having been made the commander, he seized him and taking all the troops with him, went to Haider Khān at Nau Shahr, and said to

him. Send ¹Islam Khan who is a brave man with me so that I may go and conquer Kashmir for you. Haidar Khan being deceived by his words sent Islam Khan with him. When they arrived in the village - of Jaukas Muhammad Khan in the morning treacherously slew Islam Khan and returning from there came to Kashmir and going to Ali Shah became the recipient of favours from him. ³ Ali and Ankri and Daud Kadar and others who had intended to help Haidar Khan were imprisoned.

In the year 984 A H there was ⁴a great famine in Kashmir and many people died of the great hunger.

In the year 986 A H (the Sultan) climbed to the top (platform in front ⁵) of the mosque and joined in an assembly of learned and

¹ Apparently the man who was described as the cousin of Salim Khan a few lines before. Rodgers (*J I S B* vol II V p 134) wrongly describes him as his (i.e. Haidar Khan's) cousin Salim Khan.

The name is so written in both MSS. In the lith. ed. it is Jaukash. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* it is *موضع حکم*. Col. Briggs does not mention it. Rodgers (*J I S B* vol LIV p 134) calls it the town of Jakun. Rodgers translates *اسلام خان را بعدر کسند*. Leaving Islam Khan with an excuse.

In the text edition the name of the village is *موضع*.

³ The names are as I have them in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. In the lith. ed. of *Firishtah* they are *علی ماکری و داؤد کدار*. Ali Makri and Daud Kadar. In the text edition M. Hidayat Hosain has adopted *علی دابکری و داؤد کدار*.

⁴ Prayyabhatta mentions the accession of Ali Khan in line 600 (see note 3 p 748) and then describes in the next five lines his impartial justice and the happiness of the people and then says in line 606 *अकस्मादवधौभूत बभूवाय दिग्ग सुख । भाविदुमिचसद्वाररीद्रकालानलापम ।* i.e. suddenly the face of the quarters became red like the fire of the terrible times indicating the destruction to be caused by the coming famine. The horrors of the famine are described in lines 607 to 614. All family ties were broken asunder the people clamoured for the flesh of an elephant which had died at the ling's gate and even a boy was killed and his flesh was sold for human consumption. Then there was a great storm and a great conflagration (lines 615-621). Then in line 622 it is said *नववर्षजितान भगान मुक्ता च धरणीपति । दुमिचपोडाविजृम्भि कचमिव ययौ दिव ।* i.e. the Lord of the world having enjoyed all pleasures for nine years went to heaven as if to give information of the hardships caused by the famine.

⁵ The year is 985 in *Firishtah* lith. ed.

pious men Then bringing a book called the ¹ *Mishluāt* to that assembly, he in accordance with a tradition which had come down in respect of the excellences of repentance, repented of his sins, and after making ablutions occupied himself with offering his prayers and reading the *Qurān* After he had finished these, he mounted with the intention of playing *Chaugān* (polo), and going to the field of 'Īdqāh engaged in the game Accidentally he was hit on the stomach by a wooden bow of his saddle, and died of that injury

AN ACCOUNT OF YŪSUF KHĀN, SON OF 'ALĪ SHĀH

When 'Alī Shāh passed away, his brother ² Abdāl Khān did not, for fear of his nephew Yūsuf Khān accompany the funeral procession Yūsuf sent ³ Saiyid Mubārak Khān, and Bābā Khalīl to him with the message, "Come and bury your brother If you accept me as the Sultān then it is all right, otherwise you be the ruler and I shall be ⁴ your subject " When they took Yūsuf Khān's message to Abdāl

¹ The word is مشکاب in the MSS, and مشکوة in the lith ed both of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah* The correct name is مسكوة It is a very popular collection of the Traditions by *Al-Khatīb-At Tabrizī*, who was an eminent Traditionist, and who flourished in the first half of the 8th century Hijra The work is an enlarged recension of an older book by *Al-Baghavi*, who died A H 516, A D 1142, entitled *Masābīh-As Sunna* The full title is مسكوة المصابيح, *Mishluāt al-Masābīh* (Niches for the lamps)

² According to Piājyabhata, Abdāl Khān was enraged at Yūsuf's succeeding his father 'Alī Shāh He claimed that the succession should pass to the brother Lines 623-24 say, 'तस्मिन् प्रयाते त्रिदिव नरन्त्रे राज्य गृहीते च तदीयपुत्रे । अञ्जलखानोऽपि चकार कोप पितृय एतस्य सहीभृतोऽपि । यदापि क्षियते भ्राता भ्राता गृह्णाति तत्पद । इत्य कुलक्रमोऽस्माक कथं राज्य स इच्छति । Then line 625 says there was a fight between Abdāl and Yūsuf, who is called योसोभशाह, at Sekandarapura, about which place I cannot find anything, and the former क्षत्वारिभैनिक । कुतूहलेनैव दिव ययौ भ्रातृदिदृश्या । (l 626), i e, after slaying the troops went to heaven as if with curiosity to see his brother

Yūsuf Khān is said to have given away much treasure to blot out the memory of Karna, Māndhātā (line 627)

³ *Firishtah* also has Saiyid Mubārak Khān and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 525) Syud Moobarik Khan, but Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 135) has Sayyid Mubārīz Khān

⁴ One MS omits the word شما The other has تابع instead of تابع من تابع ذلک ~ واهم بود *Firishtah* lith ed is more explicit, and has

Khan the latter said I am coming, relying on your words and I am girding up my loins in your service If I receive any injury that will be on your shoulders (i.e. you will be responsible for it) Saiyid Mubarak who was on bad terms with Abdal said We have also to go to Yusuf and take promises and engagements from him With this agreement the meeting broke up When (Saiyid Mubarak) went to Yusuf he said to him Abdal Khan did not come in compliance with your words Abdal Bhat said We should go very quickly and attack him and then we could bury Alī Shah Yūsuf Khan mounted at once and marched and attacked him (Abdal Khan) The latter came and met him and was slain Hasan Khan son of Saiyid Mubarak Khan was also slain in the skirmish The next day he buried Alī Shah and Yusuf became the ruler in the place of his father

After two months ¹ Saiyid Mubarak Khan and Alī Khan and others crossed the river with the intention of creating a revolt Yūsuf Khān advanced against them in concert with ² Muhammad Khān the murderer of Salim Khan and Muhammad Khan who was the commander of the vanguard taking time by the forelock came and confronted the enemy with sixty men but was slain ³Yusuf asked

¹ See line 628 of Prajyabhatta which says *मामारखानाप्रदूर युद्धचिकीषया* i.e. Mubarak Khan went away to a distance wishing to fight (with Yusuf) and line 69 says Muhammad Khan Yusuf's servant fought with Mubarak Khan in the neighbourhood of Didda Matha which according to Stein's *Rajatarangini* vol II page 448 is now the large quarter of Didamar which forms the western end of the city of Srinagar on the right river bank The *Matha* was built by queen Didda for the accommodation of travellers from various parts of India The fact of Muhammad Khan being slain is mentioned in line 631

² See page 750 where he was described as Muhammad Khan Chak Firishtah lith ed has a different reading It says *یوسف سائے باغیان محمد* *ماکری کہ مر اول او بود* The correctness of the *Tabaqat* is proved by Prajyabhatta (l 63) See the preceding note

³ Prajyabhatta (l 633) says Yusuf after enjoying the pleasures of rule for two and half months *अगमन इत्युक्तानां मास पञ्चतद्विंशति* i.e. he went to the inaccessible mountains the country of the Khaṣas These it may be said parenthetically belonged to a tribe which is mentioned in the *Bṛhat Samhita* of Varahamihira (ca 500 A.D.) and they have been identified with the

for quarter, and came to Hīrahpūr, and ¹ Saiyid Mubārak Khān sat on the seat of authority

After some time Muhammad Yūsuf Khān, acting on letters sent to him by (some) Kashmīrīs, made an attempt on Kashmīr Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this news arrayed his troops and started to fight with him Yūsuf Khān was again unable to withstand him, and went to the village of ² Barsāl, which is situated in the jungle Saiyid Mubārak Khān hastened in pursuit of him, and a battle took place Yūsuf Khān fled to the mountains round about, and Saiyid Mubārak Khān came to Kashmīr with victory and triumph He deceitfully summoned 'Alī Khān, son of Naurōz, and imprisoned him The other Chaks, such as Lōhai Chak, Haidai Chak and Hasti Chak did not come to him through fear (Saiyid Mubārak Khān) sent Bābā Khalil and Saiyid Barkhūrdār to them, and summoned them after making conditions and engagements They all came to him, and having obtained his permission, went away to their respective places

On the way ³ they settled among themselves, that Yūsuf should be sent for, and placed on the throne They sent a messenger to Yūsuf Khān from the place where they were Saiyid Mubārak Khān on hearing this was dismayed, and sent ⁴ Muhammad Khān Mākṣī to Yūsuf, so that he might tell the latter, that he (Saiyid Mubārak

present Khaka tribe, to which most of the petty chiefs in the *Vitastā* valley below Kashmīr and in the neighbouring hills belong

¹ The usurpation of Saiyid Mubārak Khān does not appear to be mentioned in so many words by Firishtah, but it is mentioned by Prājyabhatta, line 634, and by the Cambridge History of India, page 292

² The name is Barsāl in the MS, and Barmāl in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*, and Parthāl in that of Firishtah Col Briggs (vol IV, p 525) has Hurunpal Nursak, and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 136) has Parthāl Prājyabhatta does not mention the place, but proceeds at once to mention Yūsuf's going to Akbar, who is called समसुष्टयिवीपालन्यसालदीनभूपति । (l 635)

³ Prājyabhatta in lines 636, 637 says that gradually the people became hostile to Mubārak Khān, and he died (उवास देवतागारे) after having enjoyed happiness for one and a quarter month (सपादस्यैव मासस्य सुख कृत्वा)

⁴ The name is as I have it in the text in one MS and in the lith ed In the other MS it looks like Muhammad Khān Kasi, and this has been followed in the text edition The name is not mentioned in Firishtah or elsewhere

Khan) would accept him as the Sultan and was repentant of what he had done. Muhammad Khan on leaving him joined his enemies. Saiyid Mubarak Khan became still more distressed and determined that he would go with his sons and slaves to Yusuf Khan and with this determination left the city and went to the *Idgah*. He took Ali Khan the son of Nauroz Bhat whom he had imprisoned with him. Daulat Khan who was one of his *amirs* fled from him. He in greater confusion released Ali Khan from confinement and went alone to the *Khanqah* of Baba Khalil. ¹ Haidar Chak said to Ali Khan: All our exertions and endeavours were for your release. Yusuf son of Ali Khan said to his father: Haidar Chak wants to act treacherously towards you but Ali Khan refused to believe him and started in company with Haidar Chak. Lohar Chak and others like him had assembled together. When Ali Khan came they seized and imprisoned him and decided among themselves that they would place Lohar Chak on the throne.

At this time Yusuf Khan arrived at ² Kakpur and he then learned that the Kashmiris had decided to place Lohar on the throne. He came from there to the village of ³ Dhal and taking all his men

¹ Prajyabhatta (l. 638) says that Haidar Chak and his companions defeated Mubarak Khan and installed Lohar Chak as the ruler of the country मोमारान निजित्य चक्रेन्द्रकादय । राज्ये निवे यामासु योमसकरचक्रक । It goes on to say that during Lohar Chak's reign there was great loss of life caused by lions. I mention this as a curious fact for what it is worth but I cannot find any mention of lions in Kashmir anywhere else. तस्मिन्नकाले भूमि शसन्ति सख्यत । बभूवोपद्रवा नित्य सिद्धिभ्यो प्रामवासिना । राज्यो यो य प्रतिग्राम २८६६।१।दिनिगत । निहत स स सिद्धेन पिमाचेनेव भक्तता । (lines 639-640)

One MS omits by mistake the words from مرار دادند to که لومر را. In the text edition it is لومر only instead of لومر حک as in the translation.

² The name is ककपुर in one MS. In the other the clause in which the name occurs is omitted in the preceding note. The lith. ed. has का कपुर while the lith. ed. of Firishtah has ककपुर and this name is used by Rodgers (*J A S B* vol. LIV p. 136). I cannot find anything about Kakpur or Kalpur but there is a village of the name of Kakapor which forms as it were a riverside station or port of Supiyan on the *Vistata* (see Stein's *Rajatarangini* vol. I p. 183 footnote 695 and vol. II p. 474).

³ The name is دال in the MS and دال in the lith. ed. of the *Tabaqat* and داهل in that of *Firishtah*. Col. Briggs does not give the name

with him, went to Saiyid Yūsuf Khān Lāhōrī by way of Jammū. He then went to Fathpūr with Saiyid Yūsuf Khān, and Rāja Mān Singh, and was honoured by being allowed to wait upon His Majesty the ¹ Khalifa-i-Ilāhī. From there ² he sent his Ya'qūb to Kashmīr. The government of Kashmīr was confirmed on Lōhar.

In the year 987 A D, Muhammad Yūsuf Khān started with Saiyid Yūsuf Khān and Rāja Mān Singh from Fathpur to conquer Kashmīr. When they arrived at Siālkōt, he ³ without taking their help went to Rājaurī, and took possession of it, and he then arrived at the station of ⁴ Thatha. At this time Lōhar sent Yūsuf Kashmīrī to fight with Yūsuf Khān, and Yūsuf Kashmīrī, after leaving Lōhār's presence went to Yūsuf Khān and joined him. Yūsuf Khān then went by way of ⁵ Jhavail, which was the most difficult route, and

but Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 136) calls it Zāhul. I cannot find anything about any of these places. دال in the text edition.

¹ Both MSS have پنهانی, but the lith ed has صرت. I have retained the reading in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has ملارمت. الال الدین محمد اکبر بادشاہ.

² Firishtah explains that Ya'qūb was sent ahead, so that he might gain the people over to his father's side, and create disturbances in Lōhar Chak's government.

³ One MS and the lith eds of the Tabaqat and of Firishtah have مدد از ان. مدد مقید شدہ, but the other MS has by mistake مقید شدہ.

⁴ One MS has بمومل تہہ, the other has دہول تہہ. The lith ed has دہول تہہ, and that of Firishtah has دہول تہہ. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 526) has Lassa, and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 137) has Thatta, but neither of them explains why or how he went to these distant places. Prājyabhatta (l 642) says श्रीमत्सुखपुरग्राम वितस्ताजलदुर्गम । शिथिले समुद्रोपाज उद्याद्रिभिवान् । This is definite he took shelter in Svayyapura, which was inaccessible on account of being surrounded by the waters of the Vitastā. If Svayyapura be identical with Suyyapūr, the modern Sōpūr, it was situated a short distance below the point where the Vitastā leaves the Volur. It is, however, very difficult to identify Svayyapura with Thatha or any other name like it.

⁵ The name is جهول in both MSS and جهول in the lith ed. In Firishtah lith ed it looks like جهول or جهول. I cannot find anything about this place, but the correct name appears to be Jhavail. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 526) has Jeehbul, and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 137) has Jhūpul.

marched rapidly and entered the fort of ¹Suyyapur. Lohar came in concert with Haidar Chak ²Shams Chak and Hasti Chak and confronted Yusuf Khan. The armies encamped on the bank of the river Bihat (i.e. the Jhelum). After some days ³there was a great battle. From the auspiciousness of the attention of His Majesty the Khalifa ⁴Ilahi the victory fell to Yusuf Khan.

After the victory (Yusuf Khan) marched to Srinagar and entered it. Lohar came through the intervention of Qadi Musā and Muhammad Bhat and saw ⁴Yusuf Khan. In the first meeting the interview was satisfactory but in the end Lohar was put into prison. A large number of the rebels were also cast into prison. When Yusuf Khan's mind was set at rest in respect of his enemies he divided the country of Kashmir. He separated good *jagirs* for ⁵Shams Chak son of Daulat Chak and Ya qub Chak and Yusuf Kashmiri and made all the rest his own *khalsa*. On the accusation of some Kashmiris he had the blinding needle drawn across Lohar's eyes.

In the year 988 A.H. Yusuf imprisoned ⁶Shams Chak and Ali Sher and Muhammad Khan on the suspicion that they were about to

¹ The name is سور سوئے in one MS. In the other it is سور and in the lith ed. it is سور. Firishtah lith ed. has سور سور Sōnpur. Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 56) has Showpoor and Rodgers (J.A.S.B. vol. LII p. 137) Sonpur. I think Suyyapur is the correct name. See note 4, page 756.

² The name is Shams Chak in one MS. and in the lith ed. of Firishtah it is Shamsi Chak in the other MS. and in the lith ed. of the Firishtah.

³ The battle is mentioned by Irajyabhatta (line 617 ff.) who says
 जाला यामोभूपाक्षमन्त्रिपुविचेष्टित। विनयाशक्तमुसद्ग युयुत् सूरक्षण य। विधाय
 तमुक्ष युद्ध मन्त्रप्राणिभयवत्। मन्त्रौ सूरक्षणमममाराणाभयवत्।

⁴ This is also mentioned by Irajyabhatta (line 618) अक्षरखामो योयोभयवत्
 पादमन्त्रिभयत्। मन्त्राभयमम मन्त्रि निनयमन्त्रौ यथायत्।

⁵ There are some differences in the names. In one MS. Ya qub Chak is written as Ya qub Beg. In the other Shams Chak son of Daulat Chak is converted to Shams Chak and Daulat Chak. Ya qub Chak appears as a reference to Firishtah to be Yusuf Khan.

⁶ The names are as I have them in the text in the MSs as well as in the lith ed. of the Tabaqat. Firishtah lith ed. however has the suffix of Chak to the name of Ali Sher and all the third name Muhammad Basalat Bhat. Col. Briggs (vol. IV p. 27) has the second name Ali Chak and the third named Khan while Rodgers (J.A.S.B. vol. LII p. 137) transforms the third name to Muhammad Basalat Bhat.

rebel against him. Habīb Khān fled for fear and went to the village of ¹Kasr. Yūsuf, son of 'Alī Khān, who had been imprisoned by Yūsuf Khān, effected his release, and with his four brothers joined Habīb Khān in the above-named village. From there they all went to ²Ran Mal the Rāja of Tibet, and came back after obtaining reinforcements from him. When they arrived near the frontier of Kashmir, they, owing to the differences which developed among them, were unable to do anything, and parted from one another without doing anything. Yūsuf and Muhammad Khān were seized, and brought before Yūsuf Khān, and their ears and noses were cut off. Habīb Khān concealed himself in the city.

In the year 989 A H, His Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, returning from the conquest of Kābul, made his grand encampment in Jalālābād. He sent ³Mirzā Tāhir, a relation of Mirzā Yūsuf Khān, and Muhammad Sālih 'Āqil as ambassadors to Kāshmir. When they arrived at Bāramūla, Yūsuf Khān hastened to welcome them, and taking the (imperial) *farman* in his hand showed reverence for it. He came into Sīnagar with the ambassadors and sent his son Haider Khān, with many rich presents to wait on His Majesty. Haider Khān remained in attendance for a period of one year, and then he, and Shaikh Ya'qūb Kashmīrī obtained leave to return to Kashmir.

In the year 989 A H, Yūsuf Khān went on a visit to Lār and Shams Chak fled from the prison and went to ⁴Kahwār, and joined ⁵

¹ The name looks like كسر in both MSS. It is Kashūr in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*, while *Firishtah* lith ed has كهر. The text-edition following *Firishtah* has كهر. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 527) has Gaheer and Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 137) has to the town of Khū. I cannot find any place in Kashmir which resembles any of these names.

² The name is رومل in both MSS, and رومل in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*. The name is not quite distinct in the lith ed of *Firishtah*, and both Col Briggs and Rodgers omit it. I think Ran Mal (Sanskrit Ranamalla) is better and I have adopted it. In the text-edition it is رومل.

³ According to *Firishtah* Mirza Tāhir was a relation of Mirzā Sayyid Khān Shahīdī.

⁴ The name is written as كتوار and كهوار, but it is the same as Kishtwār or Khatwārah. See note 3, page 758.

⁵ This is apparently referred to by Prājyabhatta (lines 649, 650) where, however, it is said that Haider Chak took shelter in जाङ्गल देश and there was a battle between him and Yūsuf.

Haidar Chak who was there Yusuf receiving information of this event sent an army to attack them They separated and fled and Yusuf Khan returned victorious and triumphant towards Srinagar

In the year 990 A H Haidar Chak and Shams Chak advanced towards Kashmir from Kahwar in order to fight with Yusuf Khan The latter advanced to meet them and made his son Ya qub the commander of the vanguard He was victorious in the battle and returned to Srinagar He at the intervention of the Ray of Kahwar pardoned Shams Chak's offence and granted him a *jagir* ¹ Haidar Chak came out of the place where he was and went to Raja Man Singh

In the year 992 A H Ya qub son of Yusuf Chak was exalted by having the honour of kissing the threshold of His Majesty the Khalifa i Ilahi When the latter arrived in Lahōre with grandeur and good fortune Ya qub wrote to Yusuf that His Majesty intended to go to Kashmir Yusuf Khan determined that he should advance to welcome him At this time information reached him that Hakim Ali and ³Bahā ud din having come as ambassadors from the servants of His Majesty had arrived at ⁴Thatha Yusuf Khan advanced to welcome them and putting on the robes conferred on him by the emperor made repeated obeisances and with a firm determination wished to present himself at the threshold ⁶Baba Khalil

¹ This is referred to in line 651 which says अक्षालदीनभूपत्य ययो देदर चक्र । अकाम वसुभिर्दीनो भास्करस्येव च दना ।

² Compare Prayjabhatta (l 659) अक्षालदीनभूपालसेवनाथ क्षतोद्यम । याकोमराजपुत्रोऽपि प्रतिश्लेन मूर्च्छता ।

³ One MS has Baha ud din Kambu but the other MS and the lith ed do not have Kambu after Baha ud din Firishtah lith ed omits the name of Baha ud din altogether and mentions Hakim Ali Gilani as the only ambassador

⁴ See note 4 page 756 ⁴हमर is the name of the place in the text edition

⁵ Prayjabhatta (line 658 and the following lines) gives a different reason for the final breach of the friendly relations between Akbar and Yusuf It says that the prince Yaqub was sent by Yusuf to render service to Akbar अक्षालदीनभूपालसेवनाथ Akbar on seeing the rich presents placed before him by Ya qub became anxious to conquer Ka hm r कश्मीरविजयितकथा सम्बभूव सदीभत । He accordingly gave orders to Bhagwan Das and other commanders (क्षताज्ञा भवदासप्रमुखाना सदीभता) Coming to know of this Ya qub left Akbar's

and Bābā Mahdī and ¹Shams Dūbī ²being perplexed about him kept him back from carrying out his determination, and resolved that if Yūsuf Khān went towards the threshold, they would put him to death, and would raise his son Ya'qūb in his place. For fear of this, (Yūsuf) postponed the carrying out of his intention, and gave leave to the imperial ambassadors to return

The servants of His Majesty then appointed Mīrzā Shāh Rukh and Shāh Qulī Khān and Rājā Bhagwān Dās to invade Kashmīr. Yūsuf Khān came out of Kashmīr (Srinagar), and encamped with his army at Bārāmūla. When news came that the victorious army had arrived at ³Bhimbar ⁴Yūsuf Khān (separating himself) from the

service, and came secretly to Kashmīr, त्यक्त्वा भूपालसेवन । प्रत्याययो स्वकस्मीर-
देश मागोदलचित्त । He came and informed his father, and pointed out that the
greatness of the great who are weak is of no avail (महतोऽप्यसमर्थस्य महत्त्वं याति
निष्फलम् । पर्वतमदमाकार कुञ्जर इति कैशरी) Then they all set out for war, but
after this there was a long controversy between Yūsuf Khān, who argued that it
was not within their capacity to withstand Akbar's power, and his ministers who
advised war. They even said, भवन्तं सन्तु दूरस्था कुर्मस्वत्कार्यनिर्णय । जाह्नल
देशमात्रित्यथोत्स्याम प्रत्यहं वय (I 677), i.e., you remain at a distance, we will
decide your work, we will take shelter in the forest, and carry on daily
skinnishes, but their arguments were of no avail, and he went to Rājā Bhagwān
Dās, इति निश्चित्य भूपालो ज्यलालदीनभूपते । चरणं शरणीकर्तुं भगवदासमागत्यत् ।
(I 691) Then Ya'qūb ascended the throne, and he pleased the people by
distributing the treasures collected by his father, but as usual, in the later history
of Kashmīr, there were mutual jealousy and quarrels. After that Akbar sent
Qāsim Khān to conquer Kashmīr. कासिमखाननामान चक्रेद्दरसेवित । प्रेरयामास
भूपाल कस्मीरविजयेच्छया । (I 705)

¹ The name is Shams Dūbī in the lith eds of the Tabaqāt and of Firishtah, but the suffix is doubtful in the MSS, it is Dūnī in one and Dūlī in the other. Col Briggs omits the name, but Rodgers (*J A S B*, vol LIV, p 138) calls the man Shams Dadlī شمس دودی in the text-edition.

² The word is موس in both MSS and the lith ed and موسوس in the text-edition.

³ There are differences in the readings. The MSS have نه نرم and نهیر , and the lith ed has نه بهیر. Firishtah lith ed has نه بهو لباس که سرحد. The text edition following the MSS has adopted نرم.

⁴ The sentence appears to me to be confused and incomplete. I have thought it necessary to insert the words حدادسه to complete the sentence.

army took up his station in the village of Nagar with the intention of loyally serving His Majesty the Khalifa 1 Ilahi in concert with Mirza Qasim son of Khwajah Haji and Mahdi Kokah and Ustad Latif Madho Singh came to the above mentioned village in order to receive Yusuf Khan and took him with himself to Raja Bhagwan Das The latter sent him a horse and a 2 *Siropa* after the meeting and marching from there advanced towards Kashmir (Srinagar) The Kashmiris received him peacefully and agreed that they would send every year a fixed sum for the imperial treasury - Raja Bhagwan Das returned from there after concluding the peace and obtained the honour of kissing the dust of the threshold at Atak Yusuf Khan also came with him and obtained the distinction of kissing the threshold which is the semblance of paradise

SECTION X 3 THE SECTION ABOUT THE RULERS OF SIND

It is narrated in the history of *Minhaj ul Masalik* which is known as the *Chach nama* that when the turn of the *Khalifat* came to Walid the son of Abd ul malik the son of Marwan 4 Hajja the son of Yusuf sent Muhammad Harun towards India and he advanced into the country of 5 Mekran in the early part of the year 86 A H and commenced collecting revenue there At this time news became

1 See note - page 722

2 The history of Kashmir after the treaty concluded by Raja Bhagwan Das and which Akbar refused to ratify will be found in the history of Akbar's reign in this volume The Cambridge History of India page 293 gives a summary

3 The heading in both MSS is as I have it in the text The lith ed l as ذکر طغی سلاطین سندہ

4 He is described in Muir's *Annals of the Early Caliphate* (1883 p 445) as At this period (A H 71) the right arm of the Umayyad Caliph and who afterwards for twenty years was Walid's Viceroy in the eastern provinces of the Caliphate

5 The ancient Gedrosia that torrid region extending in land from the northern shore of the sea of Oman (*Cambridge History of India* p 1) I think it would have been much simpler and more intelligible to call it by its modern name of Baluchistan

current, in the capital city of Baghdād that *Malik* ¹ *Sarandip* (who I suppose was the governor of Ceylon, but who is also called the king of Ceylon) had sent by sea a ship filled with rich and beautiful articles and male and female *Habshī* slaves for the servants of the capital When the *Shaikh* arrived in the neighbourhood of ² *Dēbul*,

¹ *Sarandip* is usually identified with Ceylon, but Raverty (*J A S B*, vol LXI, pt 1, p 325) calls it *Saran-Dip* and identifies it with *Kachchh Bhuj*

² Col Briggs (vol IV, p 403) says that *Deebul* is identical with "Modern Tutta on the Indus" The Cambridge History of India (p 2) has *Debul* "Dāhīr's principal seaport," and says further on that it was "about twenty-four miles to the south-west of the modern town of Tatta" ديبُل in the text-edition

The exact position of *Dēbul* (though the correct transliteration of ديبُل which appears to be the form of the name in Persian would be *Dabīl*) is as doubtful as the correct pronunciation of the name There is a very long note, No 316, in Major Raverty's paper in "*The Mīhrān of Sind and its Tributaries*" (*J A S B*, vol LXI, pt 1, 1893) which extends from page 317 to page 331, in which he says all that could be said about *Debal*, and perhaps a good deal more, if I may say so, and in the course of which he says (p 324), "Having clearly shown that *Debal* or *Dewal* was not *Tnathah*, nor 'Bambura', nor *Lāhri Bandar*, nor *Karāchī*, and stated that the latter was not founded for centuries after the 'Arab conquest, I will now show, as near as possible, where it was" The note goes on for pages, and although *Debul* is occasionally mentioned, as on page 326, where *Sultān Mu'izz-ud-Dīn Muhammad 1-Sām* is said to have marched against it in 578 A H (1182-83 A D), and again on the same page where *Sinān-ud-Dīn Chanisar* of *Debal* is mentioned as one of the seven petty *Rānās* in *Sind*, when *Malik Nāsir-ud-Dīn Kabā-jah* declared his independence and assumed the title of *Sultān*, I cannot find any indication of the exact situation of the place

Earlier in the note (pp 319-321), however, Raverty gives some information about *Debal* from the accounts of the early English travellers One of the earliest of these, *Walter Paynton*, who accompanied *Captain Christopher Newport* in 1612 says (p 320) that, "Boats were sent from *Diul* (*Dewal*) for conveying the Ambassadors goods and people

Tata a great Citie one dayes journey from Diul, both cities standing in the Great Mogolls Dominions "

Subsequent to this *W Paynton*, then *Captain Paynton* (p 321) mentions "*Diul* near the mouth of the river *Indus* " He then mentions the account of *Diul* in the narrative of *Sir Thomas Roe's* embassy in 1615 and of *Thevenot* in 1665-66, and comes to the conclusion that "*Debal* or *Dewal* is said to have been in 1666, southernmost town of *Sind*, and its position is plainly stated in the account of *Captain Newport's* landing

The distance given as fifteen miles from

the turbulent people of that place looted that ship and seven other ships and took possession of all the property in them. They also seized with the object of making them slaves a number of Musalman women who had embarked in the ship with the object of circumambulating the *Ka ba*. When these things were happening a number of men fled and going to Hajjaj complained to him. Hajjaj the son of Yusuf wrote a letter to ¹Ray Dahir who was the ruler of Hind and Sind and sent it to Muhammad Harun so that he might send it by the hand of some of his trusted servants to Ray Dahir. When Muhammad Harun sent the letter to him he wrote in reply that the act had been committed by robbers (pirates) and their power and pomp were so great that they could not be destroyed by his exertions and endeavours.

When this reply reached Hajjaj he solicited permission for the invasion of Sind and Hind from Walid the son of Abd ul malik.

Thathah by the river would bring us very near to the Shrine of Pir Patho at the foot of the Makkah hills and near the Bhagar branch of the Indus (p 322). Debal he therefore concludes lay in the vicinity of that Shrine but a little further the south westward perhaps.

There are three maps in this paper one without a date has Debal a little to the north of what is marked as Pir Patho and about twenty four miles to the west and a little to the south of Tatta a second which is said to be from Purchas about 1615 A D which places Diul some distance almost due south but a little to the west on the same bank of what appears to be the main estuary of the Indus and a third which is described as an old map published about the year 1700 which places Dobil or Dioul on the coast some distance to the south west of Thata.

¹ Ray Dahir according to the old Arab historians was the son of Chach the Brahman minister of the Ray dynasty founded by the white Huns who settled in Sind whose throne he then usurped and became the ruler of the country. He had his capital at Alor. The *Chach nama* extracts from the translation of which are given in H. M. Elliot's *History of India* (vol I pp 140-1 2) contains a long account of Chach the father of Dahir. It is said in the preface to the translation of the extracts from the *Chach nama* (p 137) that Nizam ud din Ahmad, Nur ul Haqq, Firishta and Mir Masum and others have drawn their account of the conquest of Sind from it.

² One MS has والى سند omittng the words و بعد after it and the other has والى سند و بعد. I have adopted the reading of the second MS. In the text edit on it is only والى سند as in the first MS.

the ¹ son of Marwān, and sent ² Badīl with three hundred warriors to Muhammad Hāiūn, and wrote to him, that he should send three thousand great warriors (*maid jangjuī khūnrēz*) with him for the capture of Dēbul. When Badīl arrived in the neighbourhood of Dēbul, he after making great exertions, attained the good fortune of martyrdom. The heart of Hajjāj was distressed on hearing of this defeat and became very sad and sorrowful. Although 'Āmir, son of 'Abd-ul-lah, had intended to take the command of the army for the invasion of Sind, Hajjāj in consultation with astrologers, who knew the niceties of their science, prevented ³ 'Imād-ud-dīn Muḥammad Qāsim, son of 'Aqīl Thaḳfī, who was the son of his uncle and also his son-in-law, and was in his seventeenth year, and sent him with ⁴ six thousand men chosen from the chief men of Syria for the conquest of Sind by way of Shīrāz.

¹ One MS omits بن مروان, while the other has مروان but omits بن. In the text-edition, however, as in the translation, the words بن مروان or the son of Marwān have been included.

² He is called Badīl in the MSS of the *Tabaqāt* and the lith eds of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 403) calls him Budmeen. Al Bilāduri (*vide* Elliot, vol I, p 119) says there were two expeditions, one under 'Ubaidu-llah and the second under Budail son of Tahfa, both of which were unsuccessful and both the commanders were slain.

³ The Cambridge History of India, page 2, insists on calling him Muhammad, and says that he should not be called Qāsim or Muhammad Qāsim, as he is sometimes called by European historians and directs that "this vulgar error, arising from a Persian idiom in which the word 'son' is understood, but not expressed, should be avoided." It appears, however, that this error is shared by Musalmān historians. Both Nizām-ud-dīn and *Firishtah* call him Muhammad Qāsim, and as to the word 'son' being understood, it would appear that he was the son *not* of Qāsim but of 'Aqīl Thaḳfī. It must be noted, however, that Raverty (*J A S B*, vol LXI, pt 1, p 324) also calls him "Muhammad, son of Kāsim." According to Al Bilāduri (Elliot, vol I, p 119) his full name was Muhammad, son of Kāsim, son of Muhammad, son of Hakīm, son of Abū 'Ukail.

⁴ Al Bilāduri (Elliot, vol I, p 119) says, "Hajjaj ordered six thousand Syrian warriors to attend Muhammad, and others besides. He was provided with all he could require, without omitting even thread and needle." According to the Cambridge History of India (p 2), there were besides the six thousand Syrian horses, a camel corps of equal strength, and a baggage train of three thousand camels.

After traversing the stages and reaching the end of their journey they laid siege to the fort of Debul and after a few days captured it and an immense quantity of plunder fell into their hands. Among those there were four hundred slave girls of matchless beauty. Muhammad Qasim divided the booty among his soldiers and sent the daughter of the Ray of Debul with a fifth part of the booty to Hajjaj. The ¹ daughter of the Raja of Debul fled and went to Jay Sinha son of Ray Dahir who was the governor of the fort of Nirun. Muhammad Qasim advanced with a stout heart against him. Rayzada ³ Jay Sinha having placed the bridle of bravery and manliness in the hand of shamelessness and making over the defence of the fort of Nirun to some trusted men crossed the ⁴ Mehran river and went to the ancient fort of ⁵ Brahman abad. When Muhammad

¹ Firishtah does not agree with the Tabaqat in saying that the Princess was sent to Hajjaj. He says that seventy five slave girls with the fifth part of the booty were sent to Hajjaj.

² According to Ibn Haukal quoted by Raverty (*J A S B* vol LXI pt 1 1893 p 215) Nirun is a city situated between Debal and Manuriyah on the road thither and is situated on the west side of the Mihran. According to Al Biladuri (*Fihrist* vol I p 11) the inhabitants of Nirun had already before the arrival of Muhammad sent two *Samanis* or priests to Hajjaj to treat for peace and on Muhammad's arrival they furnished him with supplies and admitted him into the town and they were allowed to capitulate. The Cambridge History of India (p 3) says that Nirun was about seventy five miles to the north east of Debul and near the modern Haidarabad (Hydrabad) نرو in the text-edition is apparently a misprint for نرو.

³ The name looks like ³ Jussiah in one MS and ³ ~ Habshah in the other and ³ ~ Haissiah in the lith ed. Firishtah calls him son of Dahir Fauji. The Cambridge History of India (p 3) calls him Jai Singh. Raverty (*J A S B* vol LXI pt 1 p 232) has Jai Sinha.

⁴ The Sindhu Nahr, Sind Āb, Sind or Indus from the time that we possess any authentic records respecting it was a tributary along with the other rivers now forming the Lanch Nad or the Lanch Āb of the Hakra or Walundah which having all united into one great river at the *Dogah* : Āb (literally meeting of water or waters meet) as related by the old Arab and Sindhi writers formed the Mihran of Sind or Sind Sagar (Raverty *J A S B* vol LXI pt 1 p 316).

⁵ The name is written حصار برهمنا باد and حصار برهمنا نار in the MSS and بقعة برهمنا باد in the lith ed. Firishtah lith ed has بقعة برهمنا باد. The correct name of the place however was Bahman abad or Bahman nih the Bahman no of the Sindis. It was founded centuries before by Bahman son of Isfandiyar.

Qāsim arrived in the neighbourhood of the fort of Nīrūn, the residents of the city, being in the first instance frightened by the onsets of the arrival of the army shut themselves up in the fort, and later having arranged and provided for the necessities of the army (*i e*, I suppose Muḥammad Qāsim's army) joined it, shouting the word *Al-amān* (quarter or safety) Muḥammad Qāsim granted them quarter, took the heads of the different groups of people with him, and leaving his own superintendent or commander in the fort of Nīrūn, advanced to conquer Sīwistān, which is now known as Sihwān

¹ A number of the inhabitants of Sīwistān went to Bachhrā, who was the ruler of the place, and was the son of the uncle of Rāy Dāhīr, and said, "Our religion is safety, and to pardon is our faith, and according to our tenets, slaying and being slain are not allowed. It is advisable that we should petition for protection from the commanders of the army." Rāyzāda Bachhrā relying on his strength and power uttered harsh and unfitting words (towards them), but in the end after enduring the siege for a week took the path of flight and

in the reign of Gushtāsb sovereign of I-rān-Zamīn, who made conquests in valley of the Indus and western Hind, which were retained up to within a few years of the fall of the I-rānī empire" (*vide* note 102, p 196 of Raverty's paper, *J A S B*, vol LXI, pt 1) In another note, No 105, page 196, Raverty says "This place Bahmanābād or Bahman-nih, notwithstanding that more than one old author distinctly states by whom it was founded, European writers (and Nizam-ud dīn and Firishtah also) insist in calling 'Brahmanābād', because it is incorrect, seemingly "

¹ There are differences in the readings here. One MS has مردم ابولایت برد و جمعی ار سکنه سیستان. The other has مردم ابولایت برد و جمعی ار سکنه سیستان. and the lith ed has مردم ابولایت برد و جمعی ار سکنه سیستان. Firishtah lith ed has مردم سیستان که به برهمی بودند برد حاکم خود کجراي که این داهر بود. It appears from comparing these that the inhabitants, who, according to Firishtah, were all Brahmans went to the ruler of the place, who according to one MS of the Tabaqāt was called, apparently incorrectly, Muhammad but according to the other and the lith ed Bachehra and according to Firishtah Kachraī, and said that they did not want to fight the invaders. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 405) calls the governor of Sehwan Kucha Ray, the Cambridge History of India (p 3) calls him "Bajhrā, son of Chandra and cousin of Dāhīr", and Raverty also (*J A S B*, vol LXI, pt 1, p 233) has Bajhrā

prayed for shelter to the Ray of the fort of ¹Sisam. Early next morning Muhammad Qasim in concert with the leaders of the different sections of his army entered the fortress the Siwistan and granted quarter to those who had not accepted the advice of or shown goodwill to Razada Baghira. He divided the booty and the fruits of the conquest of Siwistan among the troops after setting apart a fifth part (to be sent to Hajjaj) and then turned his face towards the fort of Sisam. After the conquest of that fort he advanced to engage Ray Dahir who was the head of the disturbance and the chief of the disturbers.

While this was going on there was a "dearth of commodities in the army of Muhammad Qasim and most of the beasts of burden became lame (and unfit for work) and owing to this anxiety and distress regarding the condition of the troops became apparent. Hajjaj son of Yusuf becoming acquainted with the true state of things after making necessary preparations sent to Muhammad Qasim two thousand horses from his own stables and the soldiers having gained fresh strength advanced to attack Ray Dahir. After the parties met a series of battles took place one after another. They say that while these things were going on Ray Dahir sent for the astrologers to attend on him in his private chamber and asked that the circumstances and the aim of the Arab army to be explained to him. The astrologers who knew the stars said: We have read in ancient books that in the lunar year 86 the Arab army would take possession of the country.

¹ The name is written as سسم in both MSS and in the lith ed of the *Tilqaṭ*. The lith ed has سلم and Col Briggs (vol IV p. 406) has Sulim. The Cambridge History of India (p. 4) has Si am. Raverty calls it Sisam, Sahl and Silam of others (*J I S B* vol I pt i p. 33). In the text-edition it is سسم.

This dearth is also mentioned by Arab historians (cfr. Raverty *J I S B* vol I pt i p. 37). Muhammad had to build a bridge of boats to take his army over to the Bahmanal Island of the Mühr. The bridge was constructed and the army crossed without much opposition on the part of Dahir. Major Raverty also says that the writers do not mention the difficulties he had to encounter such as the delay in obtaining boats, the want of food and forage and the consequent loss of men and horses from disease and months till it elapsed in the meantime. It is not clear where he got the information about the delay and the difficulties.

round Dēbul, and that in the year 93 they would gain possession of the whole country of Sind ” As he had repeatedly examined the astrologers, he knew that in forecasting the influence of the stars, they were sure and protected against all errors and mistakes, he grappled (with the difficulties of his position), and as the cup of his life had begun to overflow, he, on Thursday the 10th of the auspicious month of Ramadān in the year 993 A H, turned the face of his spirit with the greatest vigour to the ¹ battle-field, and with the help of the greatest endeavour and exertion, shot every arrow, which he had in the quiver of his devices, at the enemy, and struck by the arrow of fate died A summary of the circumstances attending the death of Dāhūr Rāy is as follows that on the day of battle he, riding on a white elephant, took his place in the centre of the line of warriors and excited himself with great gallantry and showed himself to be an expert archer While the brave men of the two sides and the warriors of the two armies were mingled with each other, a thrower of *naphtha* (or an archer) shooting arrows tipped with *naphtha* struck a flame of fire at the *howdah* of the white elephant on which Rāy Dāhūr was seated The elephant was frightened and began to run away, and although the driver struck it with the hooked goad ² it had not even the power of a whip with which one strikes an ‘Arab horse The elephant fled and got into the river The warriors of Muhammad Qāsim’s army pursued it from behind, and sent the message of death by the tongues of their arrows from different directions After he had received many

¹ The account of the battle in the *Tabaqāt*, which appears to be copied from the *Chach-nāma* (Elliot, vol I, p 170), is encumbered in the earlier part with Dāhūr’s consultation with the astrologers and much figurative language The actual circumstances attending the death of Dāhūr, due to the elephant on which he was riding being frightened are, however, described here clearly Firishtah’s account is somewhat different and more matter of fact The account given in Raverty (*J A S B*, vol LXI, pt 1, p 239) is rather brief, and gives no details The Cambridge History of India (p 5) gives a circumstantial account, which agrees mainly with that given by Firishtah and may have been taken from it

² The words are in one MS حکم تاربانہ نہ داشت کہ بر اس پ عربی بریدد In the other MS and in the lith ed are the same, with the difference that the word is داشت in one MS and نہ داشت in the other and in the lith ed In the text-edition داشت has been adopted

wounds ¹ he returned to the bank of the river The elephant came out in its own way and made the horsemen run away in all directions At this time acting with great gallantry Ray Dahur wounded as he was descended from the elephant by such device as he could think of and confronted one of the brave Arab warriors The latter with one blow carried to its end that half finished life The Rays and Rajputs on seeing this threw the dust of misery on their heads and took the way of flight and the brave Arab warriors mingling with the Rajputs pursued the latter as far as the gate of the fortress They cast down many of the infidel warriors after aspersing them of cowardice by the thrusts of their spears So much plunder and booty fell into the hands of the soldiers that these were beyond one's ideas and estimates

³ Rayzada Jay Sinha after making the fortress strong by putting into it a garrison of brave warriors wanted to come out and again engage in a drawn battle but the representatives and ministers of his father did not permit that he should again fight a battle and they carried him away to the old fort of Brahman abad (Bahmanabad) Ray Dahir's widow however disagreeing with her son strengthened

¹ The readings here are also different. The MSS have و بر کنار دریای while the lith ed has در کنار دریا سور و سب or سب which will at all fit in with the context. The Cambridge History of India (p. 5) has the driver arrested his flight in midstream and induced him once more to face the enemy. This seems to be the meaning but I cannot get the word to fit in. The account of the battle in the *Chach nama* (see Elliot vol I p. 140) is Dahir and the driver were carried into the rolling waves.

² On the other hand Iirishtah and the Cambridge History of India (p. 5) say that he was struck by an arrow and fell from the elephant. For accounts of the events just before the battle see note No. 187 in Raverty's paper (*J. A. S. B.* vol. LXI pt. 1 p. 33) but it does not give any detailed account of the final battle. It only says the Arabs made a general attack on Dahir and his forces and he was finally killed near the fort of Riwat between the Milran river and the canals of Dadahah while endeavouring to reach the fortress and his troops were overthrown with great slaughter and pursued to the gates of that place. These details do not agree with the accounts of the battle as given by Nizam ud din or Iirishtah or the Cambridge History of India.

³ The following account agrees with that in Raverty's paper (*J. I. S. B.* vol. LXI pt. 1 p. 239). The widow was named Ranibai and she is stated to have been a sister of Dahur.

the gates of the fortress, and making fifteen thousand Rājput̃s join her prepared to defend it. 'Imād-ud-dīn Muhammad Qāsim, ¹ considering the conquest of the fortress of ²Rāwar to be easy, and thinking that this should be done before the destruction of Jay Sīnha, turned his bundle from the battle-field for the capture of the fortress of Rāwar, and surrounded it. After some days, when the people of the fortress were reduced to straits, they lighted a ³great fire and threw their women and children into it, and opening the gates of the city prepared for battle and slaughter. The Syrian warriors, drawing their blood-drinking swords from the scabbards, entered the fortress and slew six thousand Rājput̃s, and thirty thousand were seized as slaves. The daughters of Rāy Dāhūr, who fell into the hands of the conquerors among the prisoners, were sent as a present for the service of the *Khalīfa*. When they came before the latter's eyes, he made them over to the servants of the harem, so that they might attend to their wants for some days, and then had them brought to his presence. He wanted that he would have ⁴one of them to share his bed. She

¹ The readings are different and none of them appears to be quite correct. One MS. has *تسخیر به مار وا کرده به مار مدکور را در میان گرفتند*. The other has *تسخیر به مار را در راه اسان دانسته شعل ابرا بر دفع به مقدم دانست و ار*. The lith. ed. has *تسخیر به مار دژ راه اسان دانسته شعل ابرا بر دفع حسنه مقدم داش و ار راه گرفتند*. It would be seen that the 2nd MS. and the lith. ed. agree very much. If the *حصار دژ* is a mistake for *مار راور*, the reading in the lith. ed. may be accepted, after substituting *راور* for *دژ*, and I have made my translation accordingly.

² The name of the fortress is not mentioned in the text-edition.

³ The *Jauhar* could not have been very complete.

⁴ The words are *یکی را ملک الیهی تصرف نماید*. The circumstances of the accusation made by Dāhūr's daughter, which she afterwards declared to be false, and which she said she had made to avenge the killing of her father are mentioned by Firishtah, but not by Al Bilādūrī, who says (*vide* Elliot, vol. I, p. 124) that after Walīd's death his brother Sulaimān became the Caliph. He appointed Sālih to collect a tribute of 'Irāk. Yazīd was made governor of Sind, and Muhammad was sent back a prisoner, and was kept in prison at Wāsīt, where he was put to torture with other members of the family of Abū 'Ukail, until they

submitted I do not possess the status of being honoured with the association of the *Khalifa* s bed for Imad ud din Muhammad Qasim had kept me for three nights in his own harem The *Khalifa* being overpowered by an access of rage wrote an order with his own hand that Muhammad Qasim wherever he might have arrived at the time (the order should reach him) should put himself (sew himself up) in raw hide and should start for the capital The helpless man had himself sewn up in a raw hide and ordered that he should be placed in a box and should be sent to the capital He died in the course of two or three days They carried him in the way described ¹

In short when the country of Sind came without dispute and hostility into the possession of the agents of the government of Imad ud din Muhammad Qasim he appointed his own officers and agents in each town and city

Historical works are wanting and destitute of accounts of the events which happened in Sind (after this date) and in no history are the circumstances connected with the events and the people of the country narrated either as a whole or in detail But the writer of the history called the *Tabaqat i Bahadur Shahi* has given the name of some of those who were engaged in the government of the country in certain years and has written only thus much in reference to each of them that he was occupied with the work of government for some years I Nizam ud din Ahmad the compiler of this history relying on the history of the *Tabaqat i Bahadur Shahi* follow in his service by

expired for Hajjaj (Muhammad s cousin) had put Adam Salih s brother who professed the creed of the *Kharijis* to death The *Imperial Gazetteer* (vol. XXII p. 395 1908) repeats the story of Dahur s daughters The Cambridge History of India page 7 says that the story of Muhammad s death is related by some Chroniclers and has been repeated by European Historians but is without any foundation

¹ The lith. ed. inserts here *و باي عام را برين لباس باند کرد* and the remaining booty might be estimated in accordance with this but as these words do not appear in either of the MSS I have not inserted them in the text

² The meanings of the words *افندا بخدمت منباد* are not very clear It is not possible to be definite as to who is intended to by the pronomial *من* unless it is Akbar

narrating the names of some of them, and ¹some of the circumstances which were included in the things known to the slave of the threshold of his Majesty the Khalifa-i-Ilāhī Akbār Shāh And all help and all defence is from God !

The compiler of the history called the *Tabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī* says, that in the earlier times the government and the rule of the country of Sind were vested in the children of ²Tamīm Ansārī Afterwards as among the *zamīndārs* (land-holders or chiefs) of that country, the ³Sūmrās were distinguished by great power and numbers of followers, they, in the course of time, having gained great power, became invested with the work of government For ⁴five hundred years the government of the country remained with the house of Sūmrās But as it is incidental with the revolution of the skies, or rather as it is incidental with all governments, that they are transferred from one tribe to another, after five hundred years the chieftainship of the country of Sind was transferred from the Sūmrās to the

¹ The word بدي in the MSS and in the lith ed is meaningless in reference to the context I have ventured to change it to بدي, while in the text edition بدي

² Tamīm, the son of Dhaud-ul-'Utbā, succeeded Junair in Sind, when the latter was promoted to the Viceroyalty of the eastern provinces of the Caliphate

³ For an account of the *Sumras* see the translation of the extract from the *Tārīkh-i-Sind* or *Tārīkh-i-Ma'sūmī* (Elliot, vol I, pp 215-223) It is described as an account of the *Samma* dynasty but is really an account of the *Sumras* The account of the *Sammās* does not begin till page 223 It is said on that page that "some men of the tribe of *Samma* had previously come from Kachh and had settled in Sind" M Hidayat Hosain has رعیداران آن ناحہ in the text-edition سومرکان

⁴ Firishtah lith ed has one hundred years, but Col Briggs (vol IV, p 411) agrees with the *Tabaqāt* and makes the period of domination of the *Soomura* five hundred years The Cambridge History of India only mentions the Sūmrās, on page 54, where it mentions Malik Sinān-ud dīn Chatīsar, eleventh of the Sūmra line, a Rājput dynasty the latter members of which accepted Islām, submitted and was permitted to retain his territory as a vassal of Iltutmish (commonly called Altamsh) Wunār, another chief of the Sūmrās, is mentioned on page 147 in connection with the account of Moorish traveller in his *Tuhfat-un-Nazzār fi Gharāib-il-Amsār*, who visited India in the reign of Muhammad Tughluq

dynasty of ¹ Semmas. Of this dynasty fifteen persons were engaged in the government (of Sind)

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ³ JĀM ĀNAR

He was the man in the tribe of Semmas who was vested with the office of government and rule. The tribe of the Semmas considered themselves to be descended from Jamshid and traced their genealogy to him. This word Jam which they gave to their leaders and chiefs preserves the memory of that connection. The period of the rule of this Jam was three years and six months.

⁴ JĀM JONĀN

When Jam Ānar drank a draught from the full cup of death his brother Jam Junan in ⁵ virtue of a mandate or testament became

¹ They appear to be mentioned for the first time in the *Chach Nama* (Illi t vol I p 191) as coming to receive Muhammad Kāsim ringing bells and beating drums and dancing. Kharim the son of Umar pointed out to Muhammad Kāsim they were submissive and obedient to the Aral. Muhammad Kāsim laughed at the words and told Kharim. You shall be made their chief and made them dance and play before him. They are called Sammas in the Cambridge History of India (p 500) and are described there as a Rajput tribe of Cutch and lower Sind and who ousted the Sumras. On page 18 it is said that the Samma Rajputs of Sind fleeing from that country before the Sumras who had superseded them as its rulers found an asylum with the Chavada Rajputs who ruled Cutch. M. Hidayat Husain has سمکال in the text edition.

Firishtah inserts an account of Nāsir ud din Qubacha before giving an account of the Semmas. Col Briggs (vol IV p 413-414) also devotes some nine pages to the reign of Nāseer ud Deen Kubbacha.

² He is called Unar in the *Tarikh-us-Sind* (Lilliot vol I p 224) and in the *Imperial Gazetteer* (vol XXII p 396) and is described as a Muhammadan with a Hindu name a fact which seems to argue recent conversion. The *Tarikh-us-Sind* gives an account of the conquest of Siwātun or Siwān by him. He is called حاتم افرا in the lith ed of Firishtah and Col Briggs (vol IV p 43) calls him Jam Afra. حاتم افرا Jam Ānar in the text edition.

³ The *Tarikh-us-Sind* and the *Imperial Gazetteer* and Firishtah call him Jam Juna. In his reign Bhakkar was re-taken from the Turks or Arabs. Col Briggs (vol IV p 43) calls him Jam Choban. In the text edition the heading is ذکر حکومت حاتم افرا.

⁴ There are differences in the readings here. One MS has بحکومت وصاب while the lith ed has حکم وصاب. The other has نا وارب while the lith ed has حکم وصاب.

vested with the rule and chieftainship of the country of Sind In the time of his greatness the buds of the desire and hopes of the people blossomed The period of his rule was fourteen years

AN ACCOUNT OF ¹JĀM MALĪTHA, SON OF JĀM ĀNAR

When Jām Jūnān passed away Jām Malītha ²rose to demand the inheritance of his father's dominions and made the people combine with him And Sultān Fīrūz Shāh came repeatedly to the country of Sind with his army, and the above-named Jām arranging his troops in the field of battle attempted to withstand him But at last, on the third occasion, the country passed into the possession of his servants Sultān Fīrūz Shāh took the Jām with him to Dehli, and as the latter performed praiseworthy services, the Sultān conferred many favours on him, gave him the (royal) umbrella, and again entrusted the government of the country of Sind to him, and granted him permission to return there ³The particulars of these transactions have been written in the section about (the Sultāns of) Dehli

The total period of his rule was fifteen years

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ⁴JĀM TAMĀCHĪ

After the death of his brother he sat on the bed (*Chahār bālīsh*, i.e., a raised bed with four bolsters round it) of rule and carried out

نوارثت I think the last is the best reading, and this is followed in the text-edition

¹ The name is مالی تهته in one MS and مالتهته in the other, and مالی تهسه in the lith ed Firishtah calls him حام بابی Col Briggs (vol IV, p 423) has Jam Bany Neither *Tārīkh u s Sind* nor the *Imperial Gazetteer* includes him in the list of the Jāms Both make Jām Tamāchī succeed Jām Junā In the text edition it is دکر حکومت حام باب هتیه بن حام ابن

² One MS substitutes امرامصدی حکومت گردید in place of مالک باتفاق امرامصدی in place of مالک باتفاق which is in the other and in the lith ed

³ See page 247 of vol I of the English translation

⁴ The name is Jām Tamāchī in one MS and in the lith ed It is Jām Tamājī in the other MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah Col Briggs (vol IV, p 424) has Jam Timmajy The *Tārīkh u s Sind* and the *Imperial Gazetteer* make him the successor of Jām Jūnā The former (Elliot, vol I, p 225) says that the troops of 'Alāu-d dīn took him prisoner and carried him with his family to Dehli

the work of government for some time He passed away after ruling for thirteen years and some months

¹ JĀM SALĀH UD DĪN

He was vested with the duties of government after the death of Jām Tamachī and passed away after eleven years and some months

² JĀM NIZĀM UD DĪN SON OF SALĀH UD DĪN

After the death of his father he became the successor of the latter and the great men and nobles of the country of Sind were pleased with his rule and chieftainship He enjoyed the pleasures and delights of this great position for two years and some months

³ JĀM ALI SHER

After the death of Jam Nizam ud din Ali Sher ⁴ claiming the dominion of his father Jam Tamachī rose up and made the great men of the kingdom and the chiefs of his tribe join and unite with him

After his death his son Malik Khairu d din who had been taken to Dehli returned to Sind and assumed the government The *Imperial Gazetteer* (p 396) says it was Iltūz Tughlaq who retook Bhakkar and carried Tamachī and his son Khair ud dīn as prisoners to Dehli After Tamachī's death Khair ud dīn was released and was allowed to assume the government of Sind

According to the *Tarikh u s Sind* Jam Khairu d din was succeeded by Jam Babaniya He was defeated by Sultan Iltūz (Sh h Tughlaq) and was taken captive to Dehli but was afterwards reinstated to the government of Sind The *Imperial Gazetteer* does not give a list of the Jams after Khair ud dīn but only mentions Jam Nizam ud dīn better known as Jam Nanda who was the most powerful ruler of the dynasty جام تاماچي in the text edition

¹ The MSS have only Jam Ṣalāh ud dīn But the lith ed has An account of the government of Ṣalāh ud dīn

The MSS have only Jam Nizam ud dīn but the lith ed has An account of the government of Nizam ud dīn son of Ṣalāh ud dīn and thus has been followed in the text edition

³ Both MSS have the heading I have in the text The lith ed however has An account of the rule of Jam Ali Sher According to *Tarikh u s Sind* (Elliot vol I p 28) he was murdered by men headed by Sikandar Kharan and Fatah Khan sons of Tamachī In the text edition the title is ذکر حکومت جام علی سر

⁴ One MS inserts امر را بعد از بار و موافق صاحب before ملک بدر حرد

Owing to this union the different sections of the people enjoyed the peace in (seats of) safety, during the time of his rule. He passed away after ruling for six years and some months.

¹ JĀM KARN, SON OF JĀM TAMĀCHI

When Jām 'Alī Shēr drank what was left at the bottom of the brimming goblet of death, Jām Karn, imagining that when a man's father was the king and ruler of a country he should, also, even without the help and favour of providence, attain to that greatness, sat with audacity on the seat of the great. But as time does not tolerate such acts, after a day and a half it poured a draught of failure and death into his throat.

² JĀM FATH KHĀN, SON OF SIKANDAR KHĀN

As the country remained vacant and unoccupied by the person of a ruler, the great men of the tribe and the nobles of the kingdom made Jām Fath Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, who possessed the necessary skill for that high office, the ruler of the country. He died of natural death after having occupied this noble position for fifteen years and some months.

¹ The heading in the MSS is as I have it in the text. But one MS has Karān instead of Karn. The lith ed prefixes *دَکَرِ حَکومت* before *حَامِ کَرَن*. According to the *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol I, pp 228, 229) he was displeased with the nobles and the great men of the city, to slay some, and confine the rest. On the day that he ascended the throne, or the day after, he held a public court, and summoned all men great and small to attend. He addressed them in conciliatory terms. Dinner was served, and after its conclusion he arose to retire to his chamber, when a party of men who had been employed for the purpose, met him at the door of his room and cut him to pieces. In the text-edition *دَکَرِ حَکومت* is added before the heading as given above.

² The heading in the MSS is what I have it in the text, but one MS omits the word Khān after Sikandar. The lith ed prefixes *دَکَرِ حَکومت* before Jām and also omits Khān after Sikandar. The *Tārīkh-u-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol I, p 229) says that it was in Jām Fath Khān's time that Mirzā Pīr Muhammad, grandson of Timūr, seized the towns of Multān and Uch. It also relates that one Sayyid Abū-l L'aīs interceded with Mirzā Pīr Muhammad for the people. Here again *دَکَرِ حَکومت* is added before the heading in the text-edition.

¹ JĀM TUḠHLAQ SON OF SIKANDAR KHĀN

When Jam Fāth Khān passed away Jam Tuḡhlaq his brother was invested with the duties of government and after twenty eight years accepted (the summons of) death

JĀM MUBĀRAK

When Jam Tuḡhlaq was overtaken by that which is unavoidable Jam Mubarak who was one of his relations and to whom the office of his ³usher or chamberlain appertained considering himself to be fit and deserving of that noble office sat on the seat of the great but he was not allowed to hold it for more than three years

⁴ JĀM ISKANDAR SON OF JĀM FĀTH KHĀN SON OF SIKANDAR KHĀN

When the field of the minds (of men) was purified of the dust of the rule of Jam Mubarak the great men of the country of Sind raised

¹ According to the *Tarikh u S Sind* (Elliot vol I p 30) Jam Sikandar succeeded Jam Tughlik but he was young in years and his uncles whom his father had appointed to be the rulers of Siwistun and Bhakhar refused to obey him and quarrelled Sikandar left Thatta and proceeded towards Bhakhar when Mubarak who had been chamberlain in the time of Tughlik suddenly came into Thatta and seized the throne but his rule lasted only for three days and Sikandar was sent for and reinstated on the throne As in the case of the last reign دکر حکومت is again added in the heading in the text edition

² The heading in the text edition is دکر حکومت حام مبارک and not only حام مبارک

³ One MS has برده داری while the other has بردباری and the lith ed has هرچه داری Firishtah in the corresponding passage has برده دار I have adopted برده داری

⁴ According to the *Tarikh u S Sind* (Elliot vol I p 230) Iskandar or Sikandar was succeeded by a man of the name of Rai Dan who had lived in Kachh and had a considerable body of tried men to whom he paid great attention After Sikandar's death he came with his followers to Thatta and although he disclaimed all desire for the throne he was selected In the course of a year and a half he conquered much territory After he had reigned for eight years and a half Sanjar one of his attendants gave him poison in his drink and on his death after three days Sanjar became Jam (p 231) The latter was a handsome youngman and he was on friendly terms with an excellent *daruesh* through whose prayers he became Jam The country was very

Jām Iskandar, who in addition to the rights of inheritance possessed the qualifications for the government of the empire, to be the ruler (of the country) He passed away after performing the duties of the government for one year and six months

JĀM SANJAR

When Jām Iskandar after partaking of worldly pleasures passed away to his appointed place (i.e., died), the chief men of Sind selected Jām Sanjar, who at that time was occupied in the performance of the duties of the government, to be their chief He accepted the summons of death, after having been engaged with the performance of the work of government for eight years and some months

JĀM NIZĀM-UD-DĪN, WHO IS KNOWN AS JĀM NANDĀ

After Jām Sanjar, Jām Nizām-ud-dīn who is known as Jām Nandā, occupied himself with the performance of the duties of the government In his reign the country of Sind acquired new grandeur He was contemporaneous with Sultān Husain Lankāh ruler of Multān ¹ In his time also in the year 899 A H, Shāh Bēg came from Qandahār, and having conquered the fort of Sēwī, which was in the charge of Bahādur Khān the Jām's agent, returned to Qandahār, leaving his younger brother Sultān Muhammad there Jām Nandā sent Mubārak Khān to attack Sultān Muhammad, and the latter being killed in the battle which ensued, Sēwī again came into the Jām's possession On hearing this news, Shāh Bēg sent Mīrzā 'Isa Tarkhān to avenge the death of his brother Mīrzā 'Īsa fought with the Jām's army, and defeated it After that Shāh Bēg also arrived there and took possession of the fort of ² Bhakkar, by the capitulation of ³ Qādī Qādan, the agent

prosperous in his time He improved the judicial administration by increasing the pay of the Kāzīs, who had before been badly paid, and used to take money from both plaintiffs and defendants of suits they tried (p 232) In the text edition there is ذکر بہومت before the heading of this Jām also

¹ The account of Shāh Bēg's invasion given in the *Tā'īkhu-s-Sind* (Elliot, vol I, p 234) differs materially from that in the *Tabaqāt*, according to the former it was altogether unsuccessful, but Firishtah agrees with the *Tabaqāt*

² The name of the Bhakkar fort in the text edition is given as بکر

³ The name is Qādī Qādan in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*, but it is Qādī Dādan in both MSS of the *Tabaqāt* A Kāzī Kāzīm is mentioned

of the Jam and left it in charge of Fadl Beg Kokaltash. At that time the fort of Bhakkar was not so strong as it is now. He also seized the fort of Sihwan and making it over to Khwajah Baqi Beg returned to Qandahar. Jam Nanda repeatedly sent armies to recover possession of Sowa but it was of no avail.

Jam Nanda who had ruled for sixty-two years now passed away.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF JAM FIROZ

Jam Firuz the son of Nizam ud din succeeded his father and the duties of the *ra-ārat* became vested in Darya Khan who was one of his near relations and he acquired all power. Jam Salah ud din who was a relation of Jam Firuz and considered himself to be the

on page 310 of Elliot vol I as a m) t d i t i n g u a l l e d s c h a r l y w h o s t r e n u o u s exertions the outrages which were being committed by order of Shah Beg's soldiers on their entry into Thatta were put an end to. If this be the correct name it would be written according to the rule of transliteration now followed as Qaḍī Qazim.

¹ Neither of the MSS. has the heading giving the name of Jam Firuz but after گدسب goes on as و سر او حام ضرور. The lith. ed. has usual heading of دکر حکومت حام ضرور. I have followed the heading in the lith. ed. according to the *Tarikh-i-Sind* (Elliot vol I pp. 234-235). Jam Firuz was of tender years and Salihu d din who was the son of Jam Sinjar, latter had pretensions to the throne but Darya Khan and Sirang Khan who were powerful slaves of Jam Nizam ud din placed Jam Firuz on the throne with the consent of the nobles and the head men of Thatta. After Salihu d din laid siege to Guzerat Jam Firuz gave him all up to low pleasures and Darya Khan retired in disgust to his *jagir*. The nobles being on the verge of ruin owing to Jam Firuz's dissipation sent a messenger to summon Salihu d din. He came and Jam Firuz's followers led the latter out of the city on one side while Jam Salah ud din entered it on the other. Then Jam Firuz's mother took the latter to Darya Khan and he was induced to collect troops and to advance to attack Salihu d din. The latter wanted to go out and meet the enemy but his brother Hujj told him not to do so and himself went up. He defeated Darya Khan's troop and sent a messenger to inform Salihu d din of the victory. The messenger was intercepted by Darya Khan who substituted a letter which purported to come from the *wa-ir* and in which Salihu d din was informed that his army had been defeated and he must leave Thatta at once with his family. He did so and Darya Khan took Jam Firuz to Thatta where he reigned securely for some years until the end of 916 A.H. (1511 A.D.) when Shāh Beg Arghun invaded Sind. A foot note says that 916 A.H. is a mistake and 917 A.H. (1510 A.D.) is the correct year.

heir to the kingdom, commenced hostilities and warfare, but as he could not effect anything, he fled to Gujiāt, and prayed Sultān Muzaffar Gujiātī for help. As the wife of Sultān Muzaffar was the daughter of the uncle of Jām Salāh-ud-dīn, he extended the hand of his support, and spread the wing of his affection over his head, and sending a considerable army with him, gave him leave to go to Thatha. As Daryā Khān, who was all-powerful and on whom everything depended, had now combined with Jām Salāh-ud-dīn, the country of Sind came into the latter's possession without any dispute or fighting. Jām Firūz betook himself to a corner, hoping for the blowing of the breeze of prosperity, and waiting for the rising of the star of good fortune. In the end Daryā Khān, who had the reins of power of the kingdom in his hands, summoned Jām Firūz, and raised him to the chieftainship.

Jām Salāh-ud-dīn, scratching the back of his head, went again to Gujiāt. Sultān Muzaffar again made preparations to help him, and ¹ in the year 920 A H, sent him to Sind, and he turned Jām Firūz ² *Khwaḡahdār* out of Sind and himself took possession of the country. Jām Firūz had necessarily then to seek for help from ³ Shāhī Bēg Arghūn. The latter sent his slave, who had the name of Sanbal Khān, to help him. He brought Shāhī Bēg's army with him and had a drawn battle with Jām Salāh-ud-dīn in the neighbourhood of Sihwān, and Jām Salāh-ud-dīn and his son Haibat Khān were slain in this battle, and the country of Sind again, as at an earlier time, came to the possession of Jām Firūz.

At this time, which was the time of interregnum, Shāh Bēg into whose mind a desire for the conquest of Sind had found its way, and who was watching for an opportunity, marched out from Qandahār, and in the year 927 A H, took possession of Thatha. The date of the capture of Thatha has been found in the words *Kharābī-i-Sind* (the ruin of Sind). Daryā Khān, who was in charge of Jām Firūz's

¹ Both MSS have 928 A H, but the lith. ed. has 920 A H. As Shāh Bēg Arghūn invaded Sind in 926 A H (see the last part of the preceding note) I think 920 A H, is the correct year.

² This word has occurred twice previously, but it has not been possible to find its exact meaning.

³ One MS. and the lith. ed. have Shāhī Bēg, but the other MS. has Shāh Bēg.

government was put to death Jam Firuz being completely helpless abandoned Sind and sought the protection of Sultan Muzaffar Gujrati. As at this time Sultan Muzaffar died a natural death Jam Firuz again came to Sind but as he saw that he was unable to effect anything he returned to Gujrat. He gave his daughter in marriage to Sultan Bahadur Gujrati and became enlisted among the latter's *amirs*. The power of the dynasty of the *Semmas* having been cut off the duties of government now devolved on Shah Beg.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SHAH BEG ARGHUN

This Shah Beg was the son of Mir Dhu'l-nun Beg who was the *Amir ul umara* (chief nobleman) and *sipahsalar* (commander in chief) of Sultan Mirza and *ataliq* (guardian) of the son Badi'uz-zaman Mirza. From before (the time of) Sultan Husain Mirza he held the government of Qandahar. ² Amir Dhu'l-nun Beg was slain in the battle with ⁴ Shah Beg Uzbek who was at war with the sons of Sultan Husain Mirza. ⁵ The government of Qandahar descended to his son

¹ The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word *Argun* is omitted. In the lith. ed. it is *دگر حکومت سلاہ بنگ*.

For a detailed history of Shah Beg and his father Amir Zuh'nun see the *Tarkhan nama* (Elliot vol. I pp. 303-312). The Cambridge History of India (p. 501) only gives the years of Shah Beg's invasion of Sind and of his death.

² The name is *دوالنون بنگ* in this passage in both MSS. but the prefix *Mir* is omitted in the lith. ed. As he is generally called Amir Zuh'nun Beg in the *Tarkhan nama* and other histories I have changed the *Mir* to *Amir*. In the text edition however *میر* is retained.

⁴ The name is incorrectly written as Shah Beg Uzbek in both the MSS. and in the lith. ed. Firsiht's lith. ed. has somewhat more correctly *سنگ حال اوریک*. The name in the *Tarkhan nama* (Elliot vol. I p. 304) is Muhammad Khan Shaibani Uzbek.

⁵ As a matter of fact according to the *Tarkhan nama* (Elliot vol. I pp. 306-309) Shah Beg who succeeded his father in 913 A.H. found his position in Kandahar precarious in 915 A.H. owing to his being threatened on one side by Shah Ismail the second who had conquered Khurasan and on the other by Babar who had seized Kabul and had determined to seize the Siw'i territory as a future asylum. Accordingly in 917 A.H. he defeated Sultan Purdil Birlas who ruled there and took possession of Siw'i and left a garrison there under

Shāh Bēg, who became his successor, and having conquered the greater part of the country of Sind, gained great power

¹ He had great literary accomplishment also, and he wrote a ² commentary on the '*Aqā'id-i-Nasafī*, and a commentary on the *Kāfīa* and a *Hāshīa* (super-commentary) on the *Matāl-i-Mantiq*, and was also a man of pure morals. In the lines (of battle), he always advanced in front of every one, and although people forbade him from doing so and said, "This kind of reckless bravery is not right for a leader," it had no effect. He always said, "At such a time I lose all control over myself, and it comes into my mind that no one should stand in front of me." ³ He died in the year 930 A H, and his son Shāh Husain took his place

Mirzā 'Isā Tarkhān. In 919 A H, Bābar again invaded Kandahār, but went back to Kābul without conquering it. Shāh Beg did not, however, consider his position to be safe there, and resolved to conquer Sind. Bābar invaded Kandahār again in 921 and 922 A H, and Shāh Beg, wearied by these repeated invasions, made over Kandahār to Bābar by an amicable settlement. After that he passed two years in Shāl and Siwi in great penury and distress, but in 924 A H, he invaded Sind, and after defeating Daryā Khān in a great battle occupied Thatta.

¹ There is nothing about Shāh Beg Arghūn's literary works in the extract from the *Tarkhān-nāma* as given in Elliot.

² The *Sharh bar Aqā'id Nasafī* is a commentary on scholastic theology called *Al-'Āqā'id an Nasafīya*. The full name of *Nasafī* was Najm-ud-dīn Abū Hafs 'Umar bin Muhammad an Nasafī, he was born in 460 A H, and died in 537 A H, 1142 A D (*vide* Brocklemann *Geschichte der Arabischen Literatur*, vol I, p 427, 1898) عقائد نيسابى in the text-edition.

The *Hāshīa bar Matāl-i-Mantiq* is a super-commentary on the commentary of *Matāl-i-al-Anwār*. The first part of the work deals with logic. The author of the *Matāl-i* was Mahmūd bin Abī Bakr-Al-'Urmavī, who died in 682 A H, 1283 A D (*vide* Brocklemann, vol I, p 467).

The *Sharh bar Kāfīa* is a commentary on Ibn Hajīb's well-known work on syntax called *Kāfīa*. The full name of Ibn Hājī was 'Uthmān bin 'Umar, who died in 646 A H, 1248 A D (*vide* Brocklemann, vol I, p 303).

³ The year is 930 in both MSS and in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. The Cambridge History of India (p 501) agrees with this date and gives 1524 A D, as the year of Shāh Beg's death. The *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol I, p 312) however, says that he died in Sha'bān 928 A H (June, 1522). *Sharh Sha'bān* is given in it as the chronogram of his death. The *Imperial Gazetteer* (vol XXII, p 397) has 1522 as the year of Shāh Beg's death, and agrees with the *Tarkhān-nāma*.

¹ AN ACCOUNT OF SHAH HUSAIN

When Shah Husain succeeded his father (he) acquired many followers and much power he went and attacked Sultan Mahmud the ruler of Multan and took possession of that territory from him and having now gained complete and undoubted possession of the

¹ There are slight differences in the heading. One MS has the heading, as I have it in the text. The other prefixes Mirza before Shah Husain. The lithed edition usually inserts the word *Hakumat* before Shah Husain.

² The *Tarkhin-nama* (Lilliot vol I pp 317-33) gives a much longer account of the rule of Shah Husain Arghun. In the first place he marched against Thatta where Shah Beg had appointed Jam Firoz to be the governor. The latter on hearing of Shah Beg's death assumed a hostile attitude but on Shah Husain marching against him he fled to Kach whence he returned with a large following. The force however was destroyed with great slaughter. In 931 A.H. he advanced against Uch and on arriving near it he defeated the Multan army which met him there and seized Uch. Sultan Muhammad Langah (he is however called Sultan Mahmud further on) collected a large army. Shah Husain remained on the bank of the Ghara awaiting an attack. At this time the Sultan was poisoned by his son-in-law Shaikh Shuj Bukhari who was detected in an intrigue in the royal harem. The Langahs placed Sultan Mahmud's son on the vacant throne and sent a holy man to negotiate for a peace and a peace was effected. But one Langar Khan came and asked Shah Husain to capture the city and the latter then laid close siege to the fort. At length a great scarcity took place in the city and after some time it was captured. Mirza Shah Husain then passed fifteen years in peace and tranquillity. Then Humayun came to Sind in 949 A.H. fleeing before Shīr Khan Afghān. He wrote to Shah Husain reminding him of the ties of amity and friendship between him and the emperor Babar. Shah Husain wrote to him that if he wanted to conquer Guzerat he would accompany him with his whole army in the expedition. Shah Husain wanted to present himself before Humayun but the Arghun nobles dissuaded him and Humayun unsuccessfully besieged Siwistan or Sihwān for seven months after which he went away towards Jodpur on the invitation of Raja Mirdas. After the birth of Akbar he had again to return to Sind and took up his residence in the neighbourhood of the town of Jun. Then after some fighting with Shah Husain's army he determined to march to Kandahar.

Towards the end of his life Shah Husain appears to have been attacked by a fatal sickness. The Arghuns and Tarkhins then combined against him and chose Mirza Isa Tarkhin governor of Fath Bagh as their leader. A sort of civil war followed in the midst of which Mirza Shah Husain became very ill. After further negotiations Shah Husain made Mirza Salih the second

whole of Sind, he became very powerful. He also rebuilt the fort of Bhakkar, and also built a fort of Sihwān, and having occupied himself with the work of government for thirty-two years passed away in the 1 year 962 A H

2 AN ACCOUNT OF MIRZĀ 'ĪSĀ TARKHĀN

³ Sultān Mahmūd and Mirzā 'Īsā Tarkhān ruled at Bhakkar and Thatta respectively, independently of each other. There was sometimes peace and sometimes war between them. Mirzā 'Īsā ruled for a period of thirteen years, and passed away in the year 975 A H

son of Mirzā 'Īsā, the governor of Thatta, and returned towards Bhakkar and died on the way on the 12th Rabī'u-l-Awwal A H 961

¹ The year is 962 A H, in both the MSS and in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*, *Firishtah* lith ed also has 962 A H, but as will be seen from the preceding note, the *Tarkhān-nāma* has 961 A H, 1564 A D. The Cambridge History of India (p 502) gives 1556 as the year of Shāh Husain's death

² The heading is as I have it in the text in both MSS. The lith ed has *Hukūmat* before 'Īsā, and omits *Tarkhān* after it

³ *Firishtah*'s account agrees with that in the text, and he very candidly admits that he does not know how the government was transferred from the Arghūns to the *Tarkhāns*

The *Tarkhān-nāma* (Elliot, vol I, pp 323-336) says, that Mirzā 'Īsā Tarkhān appointed Mirzā Sālīh his second son to be his successor, and made the government over to him, and only retained the name of king. Mirzā Sālīh soon after marched against Siwistān, and wrested it from Mahmūd Khān Bhakkari. After that Mirzā 'Īsā Tarkhān led a large force to conquer Bhakkar, but peace was affected, Bhakkar being left to Mahmūd Khān, while he surrendered Siwistān to Mirzā 'Īsā. After that Mirzā Muhammad Bākī, 'Īsā Tarkhān's eldest son, rebelled against him. He was defeated, but afterwards a reconciliation was effected and Mirzā Muhammad Bākī was sent to Bhakkar. In 970 Mirzā Sālīh was assassinated by a Bulūch named Murīd. Mirzā 'Īsā then nominated Mirzā Jān Bābā, his third son, as the heir apparent. People interested themselves in favour of Mirzā Muhammad Bākī, who was then granted Siwistān as a *jaḡīr*. Some of the Arghūns then rebelled against Mirzā 'Īsā, but they were defeated, and fled to Bhakkar for succour. They were helped by Mahmūd Khān, and besieged Siwistān. Mirzā 'Īsā advanced from Thatta, and defeated the rebels, and their allies, Mahmūd Khān's men, and at last a peace was affected. Mirzā 'Īsā died in 974, after reigning for fourteen years, and Mirzā Bākī succeeded him, through the help of Māh Begam, although Mirzā 'Īsā had nominated Mirzā Jān Bābā as his heir

1 AN ACCOUNT OF MIRZĀ MUHAMMAD BAQĪ SON OF MIRZĀ ISĀ TARKHĀN

HIS (Mirza Isā Tarkhān's) eldest son Muhammad Bāqī Khān by virtue of his rectitude and of the number of his followers defeated his younger brother Jan Bābī and took the place of his father. ³ In the manner of the latter he sometimes had peace and

¹ The heading is as I have it in the text in one MS. In the other the word Mirza is left out before the name of Muhammad Bāqī. In the lith. ed. the word *Hukumat* is inserted after *Dhikr* and the word Khān after Mirza Muhammad Bāqī and the words *بن میرزا عیسیٰ بن حال* are omitted. The extracts from the *Tarkhān nama* (Elliott vol. I p. 36) ends with the account of Mirza Isā Tarkhān and there is no account of the succeeding Tarkhāns in that volume. The *Tarikh-i Tahirī* (Elliott vol. I pp. 28-84) contains an account of Mirza Muhammad Bāqī Tarkhān sending his daughter Sindi Begam to Akbar and the latter's returning her.

² Firishtah's account is somewhat similar but he omits the word *رسد*. For the circumstances under which Mirza Bāqī succeeded Mirza Isā Tarkhān as told in the *Tarkhān nama* see the latter part of note 1 above. The name of Jan Bābā is written as Khān Bābā in one MS. and in the lith. ed. and as Han Bābā in the other MS. The Cambridge History of India (p. 50-) says that Mirza Muhammad Bāqī crushed the revolt of his younger brother.

³ One MS. inserts here

حراس جمع ساخته در وقت کسیدن سنان اکثر سر ازان ازین که ناودم اسفند
مردود عادل ساخته بدیع بدرج گذرانند و فلینکه ازان بهلکه سراز نموده بودند
منقری شده سر در بنیان گذاشته بعضی برداشت و حال به بهکر رفتند و جمعی
گرفتند بگجرات بر راجه کچه نوکر شدند و اسامی چون ناحی در آخر عمر
ما حولنا بهمروسانند و مهربان منگب و خدمات عمده سرکار خود را بمردم ازان و کم
اصل سترد - و مهربان بزرگ و اکابر بود همه را بخدا و مکر عمل بهمروسانند حدانچه
منبرک عند الرحمان را بقدر رسانند و سیح عدد الوفات را بدیع بداد کسب - صلاب
و بدحوی بدرجه داسب که هیکس حرف راست بار نمی گفت - حال نانا برادر
خود را قسم کلام معتمد طلبیده منبر سید علی را که ا اخله اکابر اند باز بود درمیان
آورده سب و زور او را بزم - ااک صاحب آخر حیط او بلند خود را بزم در سنی بکسب *
e having much treasure he made most of the Arghūn sardars who effected to
be his rivals and equals careless at a banquet slew them with a merciless sword
and the few who escaped from the fatal meeting dispersed and betook them
selves to the jungles. Some of them went to Mahmud Khān at Bhakkar and a
number of them fled and entered the service of the Rājā of Bāchh in Gujrat

was sometimes at war with Sultān Mahmūd. He ruled for a period of eighteen years, and then passed away from the world in the 1 year 993 A H, and the duties of the government devolved on Mirzā Jānī Bēg.

AN ACCOUNT OF MIRZĀ JĀNĪ BĒG

² After Muhammad Bāqī, the government became vested in Mirzā Jānī Bēg, and in the year 1001 A H he became enlisted among the servants of the threshold, and the country of Sind was added to the countries occupied (by Akbar).

³ AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD

Sultān Mahmūd, the ruler of Bhakkar, sat on the *masnad* of rule for twenty years. He was insane and a shedder of blood. Whenever

Owing to the bad luck, which follows the shedding of unrighteous blood, he, in the latter part of his life, suffered from melancholia, and (often) talked nonsense, and entrusted great appointments in his government to base men and men of low origin. Wherever there were noble and great men, he had them all put to death by deceit and treachery. For instance, he had Mirak 'Abd-ur-Rahmān executed, and slew Shaikh 'Abd-ul-wahāb with the unrighteous sword. He had such rigour and evil nature that no one spoke (or dared to speak) the truth to him. He summoned his brother Jām Bābū, under an oath on the sacred word (the *Qurān*), and bringing Mīr Saiyid 'Alī, who was one of the nobles and great men of the country, between them, kept him in fear of death for nights and days. At last his insanity becoming very severe he one night killed himself.

There are some slight verbal mistakes in the above passage, but it appears to contain some facts about Mirzā Bāqī, which are correct and which do not appear in the other MS or in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt* or in *Firishtah*. I have, accordingly, thought it fit to transcribe it in a note, though I have not inserted it in the text.

¹ *Firishtah* also gives 993 A H, and Col Briggs (vol IV, p 440) 993 A H, 1584 A D as the year of his death. The *Cambridge History of India* (p 502) says, he committed suicide in 1585 A D, in a fit of insanity. His son Mirzā Pāyanda Muhammad Tarkhān was also insane, and so the succession passed to his son Mirzā Jānī Bēg Tarkhān.

² He was the grandson of Mirzā Muhammad Bāqī Tarkhān. The final conquest of Sind by Khān Khānān 'Abd-ur-Rahīm Khān, and its inclusion in Akbar's dominion have been described in the history of Akbar's reign.

³ One MS has no heading. The other MS has only the word Sultān Mahmūd. I have adopted the heading in the lith ed but have omitted the word *Hukūmat*. In the text edition the account of Sultān Mahmūd forms a part of the description of the reign of Mirzā Jānī Bēg.

he had the least suspicion of anybody he at once put him to death
He kept the roads of Sind ¹ closed from all sides

SECTION XI ²AN ACCOUNT OF THE DYNASTY OF THE SULTĀNS OF MULTĀN

Let it not remain concealed that the affairs of the country of Multan have not been written in any history from the date of the introduction of Islam which resulted from the exertions of Muhammad Qasim in the time of Hajjaj son of Yusuf. When Sultān Mahmud Chaznavi took it out of the possession of the *Mulāhid*s (heretics) it remained for a long time in the possession of his descendants. When the power of the Chaznavis became enfeebled the country of Multan again fell into the possession of the *Qaramitah* sect. Then from ³ the time when it came into the possession of Sultān Mu'izz ud din Muhammad Sam till the year 847 A H it remained in the custody and possession of the Sultāns of Dehli. From that year when there were rulers of different tribes in various parts of India the rulers of Multan also began to act as independent rulers and Multan went out of the possession of the Sultāns of Dehli and a number of these rulers ruled in succession

Shaikh Yusuf about two years

Sultān ⁴ Qutb ud din sixteen years

¹ Firishtah relates as in fact is mentioned in the history of the reign of Akbar that Muhibb Ali Khā conquered the whole territory except the fort of Phakkar. After that Sultān Mahmud sent a petition to Akbar that he would surrender the fort to anyone except Muhibb Ali Khā in whom he might send Akbar accordingly sent Gisu Khā n but before he arrived Sultān Mahmud died and Gisu Khā n took possession of the fort without any opposition in the year 187 A H

² The heading in the MSS is طبعه حکام ملتان and طبعه ملتان. The lith ed has کرسلاطین طبعه ملتان. I have kept the heading in the lith ed as the rulers are called Sultāns in the MSS also. In the text edition the heading is ذکر طبعه سلاطین ملتان

³ I have adopted the reading of the MSS but the lith ed has ارسنه اراں رعای from the year 571 A H instead of اران رعای و مسعن و

⁴ One MS has Lankah after the name of Qutb ud din but neither the other MS nor the lith ed has it

¹ Sultān Husain, according to one statement thirty-four years, and according to another statement thirty-six years

² Sultān Fuūz, the period of his rule is not known

³ Sultān Mahmūd *bin* Sultān Firūz *bin* Sultān Husain, twenty-seven years

⁴ Sultān Husain, the period of his rule is not known According to one statement it was one year and some months

AN ACCOUNT OF SHAIKH YŪSUF

When in the year 847 A H, the turn of the rule of the empire of Dehli came to Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, son of Muhammad Shāh, son of ⁵ Farīd Shāh, son of Mubārak Shāh, son of Khidr Khān, the work of government and the affairs of the empire fell into disorder, and in the country of India the chiefs of (different) tribes or bands came into existence. The country of Multān remained without a ruler owing to a succession of onsets of the wrath of the Mughals. As the greatness of the noble family of the Shaikh-ut-Tarīqa (the Shaikh of the path of truth) Shaikh Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā Multānī, may the Great God sanctify his soul¹ had made such an impression on the hearts of the residents of Multān and of the *zamīndārs* (petty chiefs), that nothing greater than it can be imagined, all the people high and low, and all

¹ One MS has سی و چہار سال 34 years, but the other MS and the lith ed have what I have in the text

² This name occurs in one MS only but not in the other or in the lith ed

³ The heading I have in the text is in one MS. In the other MS it is Sultān Mahmūd 27 years, while the lith ed has Sultān Mahmūd 27 years and some months. Probably there was only one Sultān Mahmūd. There is considerable divergence in the lists of the Sultāns of Multān given in the MSS and in the lith ed. One MS has Shaikh Yūsuf, Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, Sultān Husain, Sultān Mahmūd and Sultān Firūz. The other MS has the first four names, but has Sultān Husain II, instead of Sultān Firūz. The list in the lith ed only consists of the first four names. Firishtah has after the first four Firūz Shah, and then Mahmūd Shāh, then Shāh Husain II. The correct names and the sequence of the rulers will appear in the course of their history

⁴ This name occurs in one MS only

⁵ The MSS have Farīd Shāh, and the lith ed has Firūz Shāh. Both these are incorrect. Muhammad Shāh was really the son of Shāhzāda Farīd, son of Khidr Khān, and he was adopted by Mubārak Shāh as his son. See page 322, vol I, of the English translation of this work

the residents and the inhabitants of that neighbourhood elected Shaikh Yusuf Zakariya Quralhi to whom the superintendence of the *khunqah* and the supervision of the surroundings of the sacred tomb of Shaikh Bahr ud din Zakariya appertained as the ruler of the country and had public prayers read in his name from the pulpits of Multan and Ūchr and some other towns. He then engaged himself in the administration of the government and made a beginning by increasing the number of his retainers and by enlarging his army. He made the hearts of the *zamindars* or petty chieftains attached to him and gave increased currency and splendour to the government of the country.

It so happened however that one day Ray Sahrah who was the chief of the tribe of *Lankahs* and to whom the town of Sewi and that part of the country appertained sent a message to Shaikh Yusuf that 'As from the time of my ancestors the relationship of discipleship and belief to your family has remained on a sound basis and the empire of Delhi is not free from disturbances and disorder and they say that Malik Bahlul Ludi has taken possession of Delhi and has had public prayers read in his name if His Holiness the Shaikh would with the utmost promptitude turn his attention to the tribe of the *Lankahs* and consider me among his soldiers I shall not in every service and expedition which may take place consider myself excused from rendering loyal and devoted service even to the extent of sacrificing my life. Also at present in order to strengthen the relationship of being disciple and of devotion and loyalty I shall give my daughter to you (in marriage) and will accept you as my son in law. The Shaikh on hearing these words was delighted in his heart and took the daughter of Ray Sahrah in marriage. He (i.e. Ray Sahrah) sometimes¹ came from Sewi to Multan to see his daughter and brought fitting presents for the service of the Shaikh. The latter as a matter of caution did not allow that Ray Sahrah should have a mansion in the town of Multan and therefore he took up his residence outside the town and he went alone to see his daughter.

On one occasion he collected all his men and started for Multan and wanted that with deceit and the³ power of trickery and fraud

¹ One MS has *میرسد* instead of *می آمد*

² One MS has *برای سیم می آورد* instead of *میدارند*

³ One MS omits the word *دستداری*

he would seize Shaikh Yūsuf and himself become the ruler of Multān. When he arrived in the neighbourhood of the city he sent the following message to Shaikh Yūsuf, "I have this time brought all the *Lankāhs* with me, so that after inspecting them, you might allot various services to them, according to their qualifications. The simple-minded Shaikh Yūsuf had become careless of the fraud of the age and the deceit of the time, and met him with affection and kindness. Rāy Sahrah after displaying his grandeur and retinue, came one night to see his daughter attended by only a single servant. He had directed that servant to cut the throat of a kid with his knife in some corner of the house and to bring the blood after heating it, and pouring it into a cup. When the servant carried out the order Rāy Sahrah drank off the cup of blood. After a time he, acting with deceit and trickery, cried out that he had a severe pain in his stomach, and from time to time his groans and lamentations became louder. At about midnight he summoned the *valīls* (representatives) of Shaikh Yūsuf to attend, so that he might give his last directions to them, and in their presence he vomitted blood. In the meantime, in the course of giving his directions, which were mixed with groans and lamentations, he sent for his retainers and adherents, in order to bid them farewell. As the representative of the Shaikh found the condition of Rāy Sahrah so bad (*but* of another kind), they did not at all object to the coming of the Rāy's relatives and adherents. When most of his men had entered the fort, he raised his head from the bed of illness with the intention of seizing the kingdom. He sent his trusted servants, and others who had his confidence to watch and guard all the four gates so that they would not permit the servants of the Shaikh to come from the outer fort into the city. Then he went to the private apartments of the Shaikh and seized him.

The rule of Shaikh Yūsuf lasted for about two years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN QUTB-UD-DĪN LANKĀH

When Rāy Sahrah seized the Shaikh, he had the public prayers (read), and the coins (struck) in his own name, and assumed the title of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn. As the people of Multān were satisfied with his government, and rendered allegiance to him, he sent the Shaikh by the gate which was in the north, and near the tomb, which was the

recipient of rays of refulgence of the Shaikh ul Islam Shaikh Baha ud din Zakariya and gave him leave to go to Dehli and gave orders that the gate should be blocked up with burnt bricks. They also say that to this day which is the year 1002 Hijri that gate has been kept blocked up. He then raised the standard of sovereignty and occupied himself with the work of government. When Shaikh Yusuf arrived at Dehli Sultan Bahlul received him with great courtesy and honour and united his daughter in the bond of marriage with the son of the Shaikh who bore the name of Shaikh Abd ul lah and was better known under the name of Shah Abd ul lah. With his promises¹ he always kept the Shaikh strengthened in his heart and pleased and hopeful. Sultan Qutb ud din ruled independently in the country of Multān till after a long time in the year³ 865 A H he accepted (the summons of) the just God.

The period of the rule of Sultan Qutb ud din was prolonged to sixteen years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN HUSAIN SON OF SULTĀN⁴ QUTB UD DĪN

When Sultan Qutb ud din surrendered his borrowed life to the true owner of it (i.e. God) the *amirs* and the pillars of the state of Sultan Qutb ud din after the ceremonies of mourning gave the title of Sultan Husain to his eldest son and had the public prayers read in his name in Multan and the territories surrounding it. And he was

¹ The word is *وعد* in one MS and in the lith ed of Firishtah *وعد* in the other MS and *وعد* in the lith ed of the Tabaqat. I have adopted the first.

In other words with promises of helping him to regain the possession of Multan. The Cambridge History of India (p. 504) says that Bahlul twice set out for Multan with the object of restoring Shaikh Yusuf's power once in 1402 A D and again after 1408 A D but he was compelled to return on the first occasion by the advance of Mahmud Shah of Jaunpur and on the second by the menacing attitude of Husain Shah also of Jaunpur.

² The year is *وسب وبيع* in one MS. In the other the space for the year is left blank. In the lith ed of the Tabaqat it is 860 A H and in the lith ed of Firishtah it is 874 A H. Col Briggs (vol IV p. 384) has 874 A H 1469 A D. The Cambridge History of India (p. 503) has 861 A H 1466 A D.

⁴ *قطب الدین لکھ* in the text edition.

extremely able, and always ready (for all emergencies) and ¹ worthy of the descent of divine favours. In the days of his rule the status of learning and wisdom became exalted, and learned and wise men found support from him.

In the beginning of his reign he advanced to the fort of ²Shōr. They say, that at that time the fort of Shōr was in the possession of Ghāzī Saiyid Khān. When the latter heard that Sultān Husam was coming to attack that country, he made his men ready, sallied out of the fort, and advancing ten *larōhs* engaged Sultān Husam in battle, and after doing justice to his courage and bravery, left the field of battle and turned his face in flight and without reaching Shōr went towards the town of ³Behrah. The family and the retainers of Ghāzī who were in Shōr occupied themselves in guarding and strengthening it, and were helping for the arrival of reinforcement from the direction of Behrah and ⁴Khānāwāl and Khūshāb, which were in the possession of the Saiyid Khānī *amīrs*. When the siege had lasted for some days, and they became hopeless about the coming of the reinforcements,

¹ The text appears to me to be incorrect and imperfect here. One MS has *رود الطاف خداوندی بود*, the other has *رود الطاف خداوندی بود*. The lith ed has *رود الطاف خداوندی بود*. Firishtah lith ed has in the corresponding passage *و سراوار ورود الطاف خداوندی بود*. I think the insertion of the words *و سراوار* is necessary to complete the meaning, and this has been adopted in the text edition.

² The name is *شور* in the MS, but in one place it looks like *شور* Shēvur, though later even in that MS it is Shōr, and in the lith eds of the *Tabaqāt* and of *Firishtah*. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 385) calls it Sheevur. The Cambridge History of India (p 504) calls it Shorkot. The Imperial Gazetteer also calls the *tehsil* and the modern town (which are situated in the Jhang district of the Punjāb) Shēr-kōt, but I doubt whether at the time of Husam Lankāh it was called Shōrkōt. The name was evidently *شور* Shōr or Shūr.

³ The name is written as *بهره* in both MSS and in the lith ed of *Firishtah*, and *بهره* in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*. Col Briggs (vol IV, p 385) has Bheemra. It is *بهره* in the text-edition.

⁴ The name is written as *چنوت* and *حنوت* in the MSS, and *حوت* in the lith ed of the *Tabaqāt*. The lith ed of *Firishtah* has *چنوت*. Col Briggs does not mention the place. I have adopted Khānāwāl which is the name of a place which on the maps is situated ten or eleven miles to the N E of Multān. In the text edition *چنوت* is adopted throughout.

they prayed for quarter and surrendered the fort and went away to Behrah

Sultan Husain remained for some days in Shor in order to attend to matters connected with the country and then advanced towards Khanawal and Malik Mujib Khokhar who from before Sauid Khan was the Superintendent (*darogha*) of that place as a matter of honour endured the hardships of a siege for some days and then asked for quarter and surrendering the fort of Khanawal retired to Behrah. Sultan Husain after regulating the affairs of the country returned to Multan and after resting there for some days marched towards the fort of Kot Karor and brought the country near it as far as the boundary of the fort of Dhankot into his possession.

As Shaikh Yusuf had on many occasions complained to Sultan Bahlul of the injuries he had suffered (from Sultan Qutb ud din) and had prayed for justice at this time when Sultan Husain had gone away to the fort of Dhankot Sultan Bahlul taking advantage of such an opportunity sent his son Barbak Shah the circumstances connected with whom have been narrated in the section about Dehli and Jaunpur to conquer Multan and he also directed Tatar Khan Ludi to reinforce Barbak Shah with the army of the Punjab. Barbak Shah and Tatar Khan marched by successive stages in the direction of Multan. It so happened that at this time the brother of Sultan Husain who was the governor of the fort Kot Karor rebelled against him and assumed the title of Sultan Shihab ud din. Sultan Husain considered the suppression of the disturbance in the fort of Kot Karor as of primary importance and betook himself there on wings of speed. He seized Sultan Shihab ud din alive and placing iron shackles on his feet returned towards Multan. At this time his scouts brought him the news that Barbak Shah and Tatar Khan had encamped in the neighbourhood of Multan near the mosque or prayer ground of the Id which was situated to the north of the city and were occupied with preparations of materials for seizing the fort and capturing the citadel. Sultan Husain crossed the river Sind in the course of a night and towards morning entered the fort of Multan.

¹ The name is کوب کرور and کرور in the MSS and کوب کهور in the lith ed. Firsihtah lith ed has کوکتر. Col Briggs (vol IV p 386) has Hoot and the Cambridge History of India (p 504) has Karor.

He collected all his soldiers that very night, and told them, "I cannot hope that you will all be able to strike with your sword (*i e*, fight boldly), there are some of you the large number of the members of whose family and then other dependants would interfere with fighting. These men, although they might not be of any use in the matter of actual fighting, yet in other matters such as the guarding of the fort, and increasing the number of the troops, etc they would be of use." After emphasizing on this matter he said, "Everyone of you, who would strike with his sword should, without any hesitation, go in the morning out of the city, and the remainder of the troops should occupy themselves with guarding the fort." Accordingly ten ¹ thousand cavalry and infantry decided to go out (of the fort) to fight.

When the standard of the dawn rose in the east of the horizon, they beat the drum of battle, and, going out of the city, ² stationed themselves so that they might have the Dehli army in front of them. Sultān Husam then ordered all the horsemen to dismount. "In the first instance he himself dismounted. Then he ordered that each one of the soldiers should in common concert shoot their arrows at the enemy. When in the first instance twelve thousand arrows leaped at once from the bow strings, great confusion and distress appeared in the enemy's ranks. On the second shot, they separated themselves from one another, and on the third they turned their faces to the desert of flight, ³ and (the fear of the enemy) had in such a way taken possession of their hearts, that when in the course of their flight, they arrived near the fort of Shōr, they did not at all turn towards it, and they did not draw the bridles of their horses, till

¹ That is the number in both MSS, but the lith ed and Firishtah lith ed have twelve thousand, and this number is correct, as will appear a few lines further down.

² The MSS are incorrect here. One has *و سپاه انبی در پس روی خود دادی* and the other has *سپاه انبی را در پیش روی خود داده*. The lith ed of Firishtah has *سپاه دهلی را پیش روی خود کرده*. In the text edition M Hidayat Hosain has adopted *و سپاه انبی را در پس روی خود کرده*.

³ Here also the MSS appear to be defective. They have *و بطوری هول در دل دشمن حای گرفته بود*. Firishtah lith ed has *و بطوری حول اش در دل دشمن حای گرفته بود*. *را* *ناگفته بود* and not *حول* seems to be the correct word, but otherwise Firishtah's reading conveys the correct meaning.

they arrived near the town of Khanawal. From this ¹defeat (or rather victory) the army of Multan acquired much armunitions of war and power and prestige.

When Birbak Shah and Tatar Khan arrived at the fort of Khanawal they induced the *thanadars* of Sultan Husain with three hundred other men to come out of the fort by making promises and engagement but they afterwards treacherously made them food for their swords. Sultan Husain considering this defeat (of his enemies) a great boon did not allow the intention of recovering Khanawal to enter his mind.

At this time Malik Suhrah Duda who was the father of Isma'il Khan and Fath Khan came from Kach and Mekran with their tribesmen and dependants and joined the service of Sultan Husain. The latter considering the arrival of Malik Suhrah a matter of good omen for him conferred the whole of the country from the fort of Kot Haror to the fort of Dhankot on him and his tribesmen as their *jagirs*. After hearing this news many Baluchis (from Baluchistan) came to the service of Sultan Husain and the numbers of the latter's adherents increased from day to day. Sultan Husain then made over the remainder of the country situated on the bank of the river Sind which was well cultivated and populous to other Baluchis in lieu of their service. Gradually the whole country from Sitpur to Dhankot was allotted to the Baluchis.

It was also at this time that Jam Bayazid and Jam Ibrahim who were the chiefs of the tribe of the ²Thathwas (1) being angry with Jam Nandi who was the ruler of the country of Sind entered the service of the Sultan. The particulars of this comprehensive statement are that the greater part of the country which is situated between Bhakkar and Thatha appertain to the tribe of Thathwa who consider themselves to be the descendants of Jamshid and this tribe was distinguished above all the other tribes for bravery and

¹ The word ۛ in the Tabaqat and if this word is retained the word اعدا should be inserted after it. The lith. ed. has اقبال after ۛ. Firishtah has ۛ victory.

The name is ڪج instead of ڪج in the text-edition.

² The name looks like ۛ and ۛ in the MSS. and ۛ in the lith. ed. of Firishtah. In the text-edition ۛ has been adopted.

He collected all his soldiers that very night, and told them, "I cannot hope that you will all be able to strike with your sword (*i.e.*, fight boldly), there are some of you the large number of the members of whose family and then other dependants would interfere with fighting. These men, although they might not be of any use in the matter of actual fighting, yet in other matters such as the guarding of the fort, and increasing the number of the troops, etc. they would be of use." After emphasizing on this matter he said, "Everyone of you, who would strike with his sword should, without any hesitation, go in the morning out of the city, and the remainder of the troops should occupy themselves with guarding the fort." Accordingly ten ¹ thousand cavalry and infantry decided to go out (of the fort) to fight.

When the standard of the dawn rose in the east of the horizon, they beat the drum of battle, and, going out of the city, ² stationed themselves so that they might have the Delhi army in front of them. Sultān Husam then ordered all the horsemen to dismount. In the first instance he himself dismounted. Then he ordered that each one of the soldiers should in common concert shoot their arrows at the enemy. When in the first instance twelve thousand arrows leaped at once from the bow strings, great confusion and distress appeared in the enemy's ranks. On the second shot, they separated themselves from one another, and on the third they turned their faces to the desert of flight, ³ and (the fear of the enemy) had in such a way taken possession of their hearts, that when in the course of their flight, they arrived near the fort of Shōr, they did not at all turn towards it, and they did not draw the bridles of their horses, till

¹ That is the number in both MSS, but the lith ed. and Firishtah lith ed. have twelve thousand, and this number is correct, as will appear a few lines further down.

² The MSS are incorrect here. One has *و سپاه ابی بیس روی خود دادی* and the other has *سپاه ابی را در پیش روی خود داده*. The lith ed. of Firishtah has *سپاه دهلی را بدی روی خود کرده*. In the text edition M. Hidayat Hosam has adopted *و سپاه ابی را در پیش روی خود کرده*.

³ Here also the MSS appear to be defective. They have *و دوری هول در* and *و دوری حول اش در دل ایسان*. Firishtah lith ed. has *دل دشمن حای گرفته بود*. *راه یافته بود* and *هول* seems to be the correct word, but otherwise Firishtah's reading conveys the correct meaning.

they arrived near the town of Khānawal. From this ¹defeat (or rather victory) the army of Multan acquired much armunitions of war and power and prestige.

When Bārūk Shah and Tatār Khān arrived at the fort of Khānawal they induced the *thanadars* of Sultān Husain with three hundred other men to come out of the fort by making promises and engagements but they afterwards treacherously made them food for their swords. Sultān Husain considering this defeat (of his enemies) a great boon did not allow the intention of recovering Khānawal to enter his mind.

At this time Malik Suhrab Duda who was the father of Isma'il Khan and Fath Khan came from Kach and Mekran with their tribesmen and dependants and joined the service of Sultān Husain. The latter considering the arrival of Malik Suhrab a matter of good omen for him conferred the whole of the country from the fort of Kot Haror to the fort of Dhankot on him and his tribesmen as their *jagirs*. After hearing this news many Baluchis (from Baluchistan) came to the service of Sultān Husain and the numbers of the latter's adherents increased from day to day. Sultān Husain then made over the remainder of the country situated on the bank of the river Sind which was well cultivated and populous to other Baluchis in lieu of their service. Gradually the whole country from Sitpur to Dhankot was allotted to the Baluchis.

It was also at this time that Jam Bayazid and Jam Ibrahim who were the chiefs of the tribe of the ³Thathwas (?) being angry with Jam Nanda who was the ruler of the country of Sind entered the service of the Sultan. The particulars of this comprehensive statement are that the greater part of the country which is situated between Bhakkar and Thatha appertain to the tribe of Thathwa who consider themselves to be the descendents of Jamshid and this tribe was distinguished above all the other tribes for bravery and

¹ The word is سکسب in the Tabaqat and if this word is retained the word اعدا should be inserted after it. The lith ed has اغانال after فیرشتاہ has فتح victory.

The name is کنج instead of کج in the text edition.

³ The name looks like سپند and نہند in the MSS and سند in the lith ed of Firishtah. In the text edition آ has been adopted.

management Jām Nandā, who was of the tribe of ¹*Sēm̄mas*, also considered himself to be a descendant of Jamshīd, and was always hostile to the Thathwa tribe. It so happened that among the chieftains of the Thathwa tribe some differences and enmity took place. Jām Nandā, considering this to be a great blessing, took the side of those who were hostile to Jām Bāyazīd and Jām Ibrāhīm who two were brothers. The latter becoming aggrieved in their hearts with Jām Nandā turned towards Sultān Husam. As the mother of the latter was a sister of Jām Bāyazīd, he welcomed his arrival with respect and honour, and allotted the country of Shōr to Jām Bāyazīd, and that of Ūch to Jām Ibrāhīm, and gave them permission to go to their *jāgirs*.

As Jām Bāyazīd was not wanting in the accomplishments of erudition, he always associated with men of learning and wisdom. Whenever he heard of any learned man in that neighbourhood, he offered so much kindness to him that the latter was obliged almost without any power over himself to come to the *maylis* of Jām Bāyazīd ² and was never again separated from him. They say that the affection of Jām Bāyazīd for wise and learned men was such that with great earnestness he conferred the appointment of his *vazīr* to Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī, who was one of the sons of Shaikh Hākīm Quraishī, and who had acquired various kinds of learning in Khurāsān although his eyesight had become destroyed, and making over his political affairs to him, passed his own valuable time in the society of learned and wise men. He carried out the divine commandments in such a way that on one occasion when he began to build a house in Shōr, it so happened that a treasure was found there. He withdrew his hands from the possession of it, and sent it whole and intact to Sultān Husam. The latter on account of this act of his had very great faith in him.

When Sultān Bahlūl was united with the Divine mercy, and the term of sovereignty came to Sultān Sikandar, Sultān Husam sent a letter of condolences and congratulations with elegant articles and presents by the hand of ambassadors, and began a policy of peace and

¹ سَمَمَة instead of *Sēm̄ma* in the text edition

² The reading in one MS is وارو منقطع نبياست. The other MS and the lith. of Firishtah have وارو منقطع منگست, he profited by him, which is somewhat sordid, and does not appear to me to be so good.

friendship As the desire to follow the law of the Prophet and the fear of God were strong in Sultān Sīl andar he agreed to a specific settlement and it was agreed that the two parties should follow the path of friendliness and attachment and should be the well wishers of each other that the armies of neither should transgress their own frontiers and whichever of them should be in need of help and assistance the other should not consider himself excused from granting it After the treaty had been written and had been adorned with the signatures of the nobles and the great men of the kingdom Sultan Sīkandar granted robes of honour to the ambassadors and gave them permission to return

They also say that Sultān Husain kept up a correspondence with Sultān Muzaffar Shāh and the doors of letters and epistles were opened from both sides On one occasion Sultān Husain sent a man of the name of Qadī Muhammad who was adorned with wisdom and accomplishment as an ambassador to the court of Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī and he told him At the time of obtaining the Sultan's leave to return you should ask him to send a servant with you so that you might go and see the various palaces of the Sultan The object of Sultan Husain in saying this was that he might build a palace in Multan like one of the palaces of the Sultans of Gujrat When Qadī Muhammad arrived in Ahmadabad and presented the beautiful presents he at the time of his taking leave made the prayer which he had been ordered to make Sultān Muzaffar sent a servant with him so that he might show all the palaces to him in detail When Qadī Muhammad came back to Multan he after delivering the letter (he had brought from the Sultan of Gujrat) wanted to describe some of the beauties of the palaces of the Sultans of Gujrat He said that the tongue of description is dumb and the foot of its horse is lame and in a spirit of arrogance said that if the entire revenues of the kingdom of Multan be expended in building one palace it was not certain whether even that would be completed Sultan Husain became sorry and sad on hearing this ¹ Imad ul mulk Tawālāk who was charged with the duties of the *ra arat* put forward the foot of daring and said May the kingdom last till the day of resurrection !

¹ It is *عماد الملک بوبک* in the text edition

I do not know the reason of your grief” The Sultān said, “The reason of it is this, that people have attributed the name of *Bādshāh* to me, and I am destitute of the meaning of *Bādshāhī*. And in spite of the fact that I shall rise up with the other *Bādshāhs* on the day of resurrection I shall not be their equal” ‘Imād-ul-mulk said, “Let not the heart of the *Bādshāh* be pained and grieved on this account, for the great and holy God has distinguished each kingdom by some special excellence which is held in great respect and honour in other kingdoms. Although the kingdoms of Gujāt, Deccan, Mālwa and Bengāl are very fertile, and the materials of enjoyments are found there in the best possible way, yet the kingdom of Multān produces *men*, for wherever the great men of Multān went, they were highly respected and honoured. May there be praise and thanks to God ! that there are present in Multān some persons belonging to the noble family of the Shaikh-ul-Islām Shaikh Bahā’-ud-dīn Zakariyā, may the mercy of God be on him ! who are superior in all noble qualities to Shaikh Yūsuf Quraishī, to whose son Sultān Bahlūl has given his daughter in marriage, and whom he holds in great honour. In the same way there are some persons in Ūch and Multān, belonging to the Bukhārī family, who in bodily and mental perfections are superior to His Holiness Hājī ‘Abd-ul-wahāb, and among learned men Maulānā Fath-ul-lah and his pupil Maulānā ‘Azīz-ul-lah have been produced out of the holy earth of Multān. (And these great men are such) that if the entire country of Hindūstān were to pride itself on their account, it would not at all be doing what would be called absurd.” When ‘Imād-ul-mulk said words like this, the constriction of the heart of the Sultān was changed to expansion.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN FIRŪZ

When Sultān Husain was overtaken by old age, he in his presence raised his eldest son, who had the name of Firūz Khān on the throne, and gave him the title of Firūz Shāh, and had the public prayers read in his name. He then occupied himself with devotion and the worship of God. The duties of the *vazānat* remained confirmed as before on ‘Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak. As Sultān Firūz Khān was inexperienced and the emotion of anger was strong in him and dominated over all his other emotions, and as liberality was also wanting in his nature, he

was always envious of ¹ Balal son of Imad ul mulk who was adorned with wisdom and liberality and other accomplishments. On one occasion he said to one of his slaves who was in his confidence Balal has been embezzling the *Budshahi* property and wants to create a disturbance and having got men to combine with him wants to usurp the throne. It befits my state that before the disturbance begin I should take measures to crush it. The misguided slaves intending to murder Balal waited for an opportunity. It so happened that one day Balal went out on a boating excursion and after the evening prayer was about to return to the city. That slave jumped out of a hiding place and shot an arrow in his breast it did not only lodge in the body but passed through it. The innocent and helpless Balal surrendered his life to the Creator. Imad ul mulk within a short time caused poison to be administered to Sultan Firuz and avenge the murder of his son in the best way. When this calamity happened to the Sultan in his old age he surrendered his bridle of patience into the hands of groans and lamentations and wept with many sighs and exclamations of sorrow. In order to guard his kingdom and avenge the murder of his son he had the public prayers again read in his own name and made Mahmud Khan the son of Sultan Firuz his heir and as before kept the affairs of the government in charge of Imad ul mulk and did not at all display any annoyance or pain. After a few days he sent for Jam Bayazid into his private chamber and said You are my maternal uncle and you know the pain in my heart. You should make such a plan that I should have my revenge of this faithless and ungrateful wretch. Jam Bayazid accepted this work with much eagerness and obtained permission to leave. At night he said to his crier or herald that he should proclaim in his ² army that his troops should appear in the morning fully armed and accoutred at the gate of the palace. Early next morning

¹ The Cambridge History of India p. 504 has Bilal

Both MSS have حال بکالن مسلم بود but the lith. ed. and Firishtah lith. ed. have حال بکالن افوس مسلم بود

² The readings in the MS. and the lith. ed. of Firishtah differ a little from each other and the meaning is somewhat doubtful but I think my translation conveys it fairly well. In the text edition the clause که سلطان ار ما سامان is inserted between وادب طلبنده and علی الصباح and ندا نکند

Jām Bāyazīd came to the gate of the palace with his men fully armed and ready (for any emergency) When the news reached the Sultān, he ordered 'Imād-ul-mulk to go and find out the exact facts of the preparations of Jām Bāyazīd's and his retainers When 'Imād-ul-mulk came before Jām Bāyazīd's troops they immediately seized him, and put him in chains Sultān Husain made over the duties of the *vazārat* that very hour to Jām Bāyazīd, and added the duties of the guardianship of Maḥmūd Khān, son of Fīrūz Shāh, to those of the *vazārat* After some days Sultān Husain passed away on account of bodily ailments His death took place on ¹ Sunday, the 6th of the month of Safar in the year 980 A H, and according to another statement in 940 A H, and the period of his reign was thirty-four years, and according to another statement 30 years The writer of this history Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad (may there be pardon for him!) submits, that in the accounts by the author of the *Tabaqāt-i-Bahādur Shāhī*, two or three errors have occurred in this matter One is that he has called Sultān Maḥmūd the son of Sultān Husain, and the other is that he has placed the accession of Sultān Fīrūz after that of Sultān Maḥmūd (As a matter of fact, Sultān Maḥmūd was the son of Sultān Fīrūz, and his accession took place after that of the latter) Another is that he has described Sultān Fīrūz as the brother of Sultān Maḥmūd, but in fact Sultān Maḥmūd was the son of Sultān Fīrūz, and his accession was after those of Sultān Fīrūz and Sultān Husain

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN MAḤMŪD, SON OF SULTĀN FĪRŪZ

When Sultān Husain passed away on account of illness (*i.e.*, died a natural death), on the following day, which was ² Monday the 27th Safar, Jām Bāyazīd, in concert with the nobles and the great men and men of high birth, raised Maḥmūd Khān, in accordance with the directions of Sultān Husain, to the seat of authority, and arranged for his accession But as he was of immature years he associated

¹ One MS and the lith ed have Sunday the 26th Safar, 908 A H, the other has Saturday the 6th Safar 980 and, according to some, 904 This is incorrect Firishtah lith ed has Saturday the 26th Safar 908 Col Briggs (vol IV, p 391) follows Firishtah, but makes it Sunday instead of Saturday, and he gives 29th August, 1502, as the date according to the Christian era The Cambridge History of India (p 504) gives August 31st, 1502, as the date

² This is the date according to both MSS and the lith ed of Firishtah

himself with low people and collected common and vulgar people round him and his time was spent in jesting and buffoonery. Owing to this great men and men of good lineage kept at a distance from him. When people acquired an ascendancy over him they devoted all their energy to turn his mind against Jam Bayazid. In order to gain their object they made ¹wonderful plans. Jam Bayazid on hearing of this did not come to Multan from the camp which he had established on the bank of the river Chanab at a distance of one *farsukh* from Multan and attended to the affairs of the State at that place and passed his time in pleasant amusements.

While these things were happening one day he sent for the head men of some town in order to collect revenue from them and for other matters. As some of the headmen showed some turbulence Jam Bayazid said. Let the hair on the heads of these men be shaved off and let them be paraded round the city. The slanderers went to Sultan Mahmud and told him that Jam Bayazid had commenced to punish and to insult even some of the servants of the Sultan that he does not present himself in the *Duan* (or the royal court) and sends his son Ālam Khan. It is advisable on the score of the Sultan's greatness that Ālam Khan should be insulted in the Sultan's *majlis* so that there might be a stain on the condition and dignity of the Jam and he be disgraced and degraded in the eyes of men.

Ālam Khan was a young man of ability and was distinguished above the men of his rank for the elegance of his person and of his nature. It so happened that he came one day to offer his respects to Sultan Mahmud. He was totally unaware that the men who were envious of him had made a plan for humiliating him. When he arrived in the presence of the Sultan one of the courtiers asked him

What fault had been committed by such and such headmen that Jam Bayazid should have had the hair of their heads shaved off and should otherwise have disgraced them. It would be just that in return for that the hair of your head should be shaved off. As such words had never before been used to Ālam Khan he protested and

¹ The words look like *يعمل عجب* in one MS. in the other the adjective is omitted but the other word looks like *لعمري*. Firsihtah lith. ed. has the very simple word *دبرها*. In the text edition it is *فصها*.

said, "What has come to you, man, that you use such language to me in the *majlis* of the Sultān ' He had not yet finished his words when twelve men fell upon him from all sides, and the first thing they did to him was to take off the turban from his head, and then cuffed and kicked him with great violence. At this time 'Ālam Khān with great difficulty drew his dagger from the scabbard and lifted up his hand. By accident the point of the dagger struck the forehead of Sultān Mahmūd, who, standing at the head of the men who were wrestling together, was amusing himself, and he fell down on the ground groaning and lamenting and bleeding profusely from the wound. The men who had fallen upon 'Ālam Khān now kept their hands off him and turned to the Sultān. 'Ālam Khān, who had received many blows, fled bare-headed for fear of his life. When he reached the gate he found that it was locked, but exerting all his strength he broke the boards of the door and went out and taking a sash from one of his servants, bound it round his head, and proceeded on his way.

When he arrived in the presence of the Jām Bāyazīd and explained what had happened, the Jām said, "Oh my son, what you have done has become the cause of (our) shame in both the worlds, but as it is not possible to remedy it now, go to Shōr with all quickness, and send the whole of the army with all despatch, so that before Sultān Mahmūd should have collected all his troops, I may send all my men to Shōr." He sent 'Ālam Khān immediately to Shōr, and when his army arrived from there, he struck the drum for the march, and started for Shōr.

Sultān Mahmūd on hearing this news nominated some of the *amīrs* to pursue him. When the two armies approached each other, Jām Bāyazīd turned round, and took up a position and the war-like men belonging to the two armies went forward and fought bravely with each other. In the end, Jām Bāyazīd defeated the Sultān's army, and proceeded towards Shōr. When he arrived there, he had the public prayers read, and the coins struck, in the name of Sultān Sikandar, son of Bahlūl, and explaining all that had happened in a petition, sent it to him. The latter sent a *farmān* of encouragement, and a robe of honour to Jām Bāyazīd, and wrote another *farmān* to Daulat Khān Lūdī, who was the governor of the Punjāb to the effect, that "As Jām Bāyazīd has appealed to me for protection, and has read the public prayers in my name, it behoves you that you

should make yourself acquainted with all the circumstances and should not hold yourself excused from helping and assisting him and whenever he should be in need of any reinforcement you should go yourself to give it to him

After some days Sultan Mahmud collected all his army and advanced towards Shōr Jam Bayazid and Ālam Khan in concert with their men came out of Shor and met them at a distance of ten *karohs* from that place and encamped with the river Ravi in front of him Jam Bayazid also sent a letter to Daulat Khan Ludi and notified him with what had happened No battle had yet taken place between the armies of Sultan Mahmud and Jam Bayazid when Daulat Khan came with the army of the Punjab to reinforce Jam Bayazid and sending men in whom he had confidence to wait on Sultan Mahmud began negotiations for an amicable settlement and in the end through his exertions a settlement was effected on the basis of the river Ravi being recognized as the boundary between the territories of the two parties and neither party transgressing it Daulat Khan Ludi then sent Sultan Mahmud to Multan and escorted Jam Bayazid to Shor and from there he went back to Lahore But in spite of the fact that a man like Daulat Khan Ludi had intervened to effect the peace it did not have any stability

About this time ¹ Mir Jakar Zand came to Multan from the direction of Sewi with his two sons Mir ² All-iddad and Mir Shahdad Mir ⁴ Shahdad was the first man who promulgated the Shi'a religion in Multan As Malik Suhrab Duda was held in great honour by the

¹ The name looks like *مرحاکر دند* Mir ? Jakar Dand or Zand in one MS and *برحاکر دوزد* Bar Jakar Duzid in the other In the lith ed of Firishtah the name looks like *میر عماد کوثری* Mir Imād Karwizī Col Briggs (vol IV p 336) has *میر جاکر زند* and he says in a footnote that the name Jakar occurs among the early Sulṭān's folk It is *مرحاکراند* in the text edition

The name is *سوی* in both MSS It is *سولی* in the lith ed of Firishtah and Solypoor in Col Briggs (vol IV p 396)

² The names are *داد الله* and *میر الله داد* or *میر شهداد* in the two MSS Firishtah lith ed has what looks like *مرزا شهد* and *مرزا شهدا* Col Briggs (vol IV p 396) calls them Meer Sheheed and Meer Shah da

⁴ Firishtah takes exception to this statement of Nizām ud-dīn and says that the latter does not say who Mir Imad was and whence he came etc

Lankāhs, Mī Jākar Zand could not remain there, and sought an asylum with Jām Bāyazīd. As he was the head of a clan, Jām Bāyazīd received him with much honour, and bestowed on him and his sons a part of the territory which was in the *Khālsa* or crown land.

Jām Bāyazīd was a man of high moral character and of a generous disposition, and showed much kindness to learned men and was generous to the men of piety. They say that at the time of the hostility (between Sultān Mahmūd and himself), he sent gifts and arms to learned and pious men by boats from Shōr to Multān, and one after another many favours were shown by him to the great men of Multān. Many wise men leaving their birthplace took up their residence in Shōr, and he summoned a number of them with much eagerness. Among them he prayed His Holiness Maulānā 'Azīz-ul-lah, who was a disciple of Maulānā Fath-ul-lah, with great solicitude to come to Shōr. When the latter arrived near Shōr, he met him with great respect, and bringing him with great honour into the city, took him with great courtesy to his own harem, and ordered his own servants that they should pour water over his hands, and he also directed that they should pour that water at the four corners of the house, for the sake of the good fortune which it would bring to it.

A wonderful story has been told of Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī who was the *vakīl* (minister) of Jām Bāyazīd, which, though it has no bearing on the subject matter (of this history), but, on account of its miraculous nature and to guard it from the evil of neglect, is being written down here with the pen of musk-like fragrant writing. They narrate that when His Holiness Maulānā 'Azīz-ul-lah came to Shōr and was received with great respect and honour, greater than what the men of the age had expected, from Jām Bāyazīd and the latter took him into his own harem, and ordered the maid-servants to wait on him. Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī sent a man to wait on the Maulānā with the message that the Jām Bāyazīd sends his prayers (for the Maulānā's well-being), and his object in ordering the maids to attend before him was this that as he had come unattended by any one, if he would notify whichever of them finds favour in his eyes, she would be sent to serve him. The Maulānā sent a verbal reply to the effect that "God forbid! that any man should cast an evil eye on the maids in the service of his friend, and besides the age and years of this *faqīr* do not agree with such an insinuation." When the servant

of Maulana Azīz ul lah went and gave the message to Jam Bīyazīd the latter said I have no knowledge whatever of such a message The Maulana was ashamed and said May the neck of the man who has done this thing be broken and without going to see the Jam he took his way to his own house and before the news could reach the Jam he had passed beyond the boundary of the latter's territory In the end it came to pass as had been said by the Maulana for when Shaikh Jalāl ud dīn returned from the service of Sultan Sikandar and came to Shor one night his foot slipped when he was on the terrace (of his house) he fell on his head and his neck was broken

When His Majesty Firdus Makani Zahir ud dīn Babar Badshah Chāzi took possession of the Punjab in the year 930 A H and marched towards Dehli he sent a *farmān* to Mirza Shah Husain Arghun the ruler of Thatha that he had bestowed Multan and the neighbouring territory on him Mirza Shah Husain Arghun crossed the river near the fort of Bhakkar and the blast of the wrath of the God began to blow and inundation of arrogance began to flow Sultan Mahmud on hearing this news trembled for fear and collected his troops and coming two stages out of the city of Multan sent Shaikh Baha ud dīn Quraishi who was the successor of the Shaikh ul Islam Shaikh Baha ud dīn Zakariya may his soul be sanctified¹ as his ambassador to Mirza Shah Husain and he made Maulana Bahlul who in the beauty of his diction and in the expression of his meaning was far in advance of the age to be the assistant of Shaikh Baha ud dīn When the latter arrived in the camp of Mirza Shah Husain the latter treated them with courtesy and respect and after the former had performed his duties as ambassador Mirza Shah Husain said in reply My object in coming was to look after the training of Sultan Mahmūd and for making a pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh Baha ud dīn Maulana Bahlul said What would happen if the training of Sultan Mahmud should be left to His Holiness the asylum of the Prophetship may the benediction of God be on him and on his descendants¹ for he has given him the necessary spiritual training and as to the second matter Shaikh Baha ud dīn has himself come to attend on you and what necessity is there for your taking further trouble in the matter When Shaikh Baha ud dīn came back to Sultan Mahmud the latter died the next night of an attack of colic The surmise of some men was that Langar Khan who was a slave of the dynasty had

administered poison to him. His death took place in 931 A.H., and the period of his rule was twenty-seven years.

AN ACCOUNT OF SULTĀN HUSAIN, SON OF SULTĀN MAHMŪD

When Sultān Mahmūd had passed away, Qawām Khān Lankāh and Langai Khān, who were the commanders of Sultān Mahmūd's army, took the path of flight and joined Mīrzā Shāh Husain. They received such favours as their hearts wished for, and brought the towns (appertaining) to Multān under the rule of the Mīrzā. The rest of the *amāns* of the Lankāh tribe, being discomfited, returned to Multān. There they gave Sultān Husain, son of Sultān Mahmūd, who had not yet passed the age of infancy, the title of Sultān Husain, and read the public prayers in his name. Although they gave the name of Sultān to him, yet Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk Bukhārī, who was the son-in-law of Sultān Mahmūd, assumed the name of *vazir*, and took upon himself the administration of all matters of State. He was, however, without any experience, and although they did not have provisions sufficient for even one month in the fort of Multān he decided on defending it. Mīrzā Shāh Husain considering the death of Sultān Mahmūd the means of his conquering Multān gave the people of the city no time for preparation for defence, and galloped in, and laid siege to the fort. When the siege had lasted for some days, the soldiers distressed by hunger, came to Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk,¹ who was the minister responsible for the ruin of the country of Multān, and said to him, "Our horses are yet fresh, and we find the strength of fighting in ourselves. It is better, that having divided the troops, we should advance to the field of battle. It may be that the breeze of victory and triumph would blow on us. The other alternative is to guard the fort in the hope of reinforcement and help, but there is

¹ The readings are different. One MS has *که عمده ورائی ولایت اورو بود*, while the other has *که عمده ولایت ملتان اریس او بوده*. Firishtah in the corresponding passage has *که عمده حوائی ملک اریس او بود*. None of the readings is quite clear. The word *عمده*, one of the meanings of which is a minister, is the stumbling block. The reading of the first MS and of Firishtah may mean who was the minister who was responsible for the ruin of the country, and I have adopted this reading. In the text edition the passage reads *که عمده حوائی ولایت ملتان اریس او بوده*.

no such hope from any side. Shaikh Shuja ul mulk gave them no reply at the interview but he summoned some of the trusted leaders to a private conference and said. The rule of Sultan Husain has not yet acquired any strength or stability. If we go out of the city with the determination to fight there is a very strong likelihood that most of the men would in the hope of obtaining favour from Mirza Shah Husain go to him and render him homage and the few who are bound by a sense of honour would stand firmly in that field of battle and would be slain.

¹ It is related that Maulana Sa'd ul lah Lahori who was one of the wise men of the age said. I was at that time in the citadel of Multan. When the siege had gone on for some months the troops of Mirza Husain shut up all the entrances and exits in such a way that no one could send any help to the garrison from outside and nobody going out of the fort could betake himself to a nook or corner of safety. Gradually the subsistence and the life of the men in the garrison were reduced to such straits that if by accident a cat or a dog fell into their hands they devoured its flesh like that of a kid or lamb. Shaikh Shuja ul mulk appointed a *qazi* of the name of Jada to be a commander of three thousand infantry men of the town and nominated him to be the defender of the fort. That misguided man went to the house of any poor man who he imagined had any grain in his possession and without any enquiry plundered it. Owing to these improper acts of his men raised their hands in prayer and according

¹ The MSS say here *و مولانا سعد الله لاہوری کہ از افاضل وہب بود متکلف* and then go on to say what I have said had happened during the siege. This cannot be correct as the siege was yet going on and the incidents mentioned by the Maulana had not yet happened. I have accordingly substituted what is written in the lith ed of *Firishtah* in which what the Maulana had said has been recorded as a matter of tradition. The name of the Maulana is Sa'd ud din in the lith ed of *Firishtah*. I have however retained the name of Sa'd ul lah as that is also the name given by Col Briggs. The text edition has followed the MSS.

² There are some differences in the readings. One MS calls the man *حادہ نام باحی* while the other has *حادہ نام باحی* and *Firishtah* lith ed has *حادا نام باحی*. Then one MS has by mistake *سرداری سرکار بادہ فصائی* instead of *سرداری سے ہزار بادہ فصائی* as in the other MS and in the lith ed of both the *Tabaqat* and the *Firishtah*.

In the text edition it is *حادو نام باحی* instead of *حادہ نام باحی*.

to the purport of the saying that any change is for the better though it may involve our loss, prayed for the ruin of Shujā'-ul-mulk. In the end ¹ men having considered their being slain easier, threw themselves from the ramparts into the ditch below, and Mīrzā Shāh Husain having become aware of the terrible distress of the men in the fort, stopped his men from slaying them. After this when the siege had been prolonged for a year and some months, one night towards morning the servants of the Mīrzā entered the fort, and stretching out the hand of rapine from the sleeve of oppression began to slay and devastate. The residents of the city from the age of seven to that of seventy years, who escaped the sword, were taken into slavery, and every one against whom there was a suspicion of his having any gold, suffered much insult and torture. This calamity occurred about the end of the year 932 A H."

Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah has narrated the following about himself, "When the citadel was taken by the Arghūns, a number of men entered our house, and at first a man seized my father, who bore the name of Maulānā Ibiāhīm Jāma', and who seated on the *masnad* or carpet of teaching had for five and sixty years given lessons in various branches of learning, and had towards the end of his life become blind, and began to treat him with insult and contumely. Others came in, and suspecting from the cleanliness of the house, and the elegance of the buildings that the inmates were wealthy people, one of them seized me as a captive. It so happened that that man took me as a present to the *vazīr* of the Mīrzā, and it also so happened, that the *vazīr* was seated at that time in the courtyard of a house on a wooden seat. He gave orders, in compliance with which the man put a chain on my feet and tied the end of it strongly to a leg of the *vazīr*'s seat. The tears were flowing freely from my eyes, and I was weeping chiefly on account of the condition of my father. After a little while the *vazīr* sent for a ² receptacle for pens, etc., and after mending his pen

¹ Firishtah explains that as everyone who attempted to go out by the gate was killed by the besiegers, the men in the garrison threw themselves from the ramparts.

² The word looks like *محرر* in one MS and in the lith. eds of the *Tabaqāt* and *Firishtah*, but it is *فادان* in the other MS. In the text-edition M. Hidayat Hosain has used the right word *محرر*, which is a synonym for *فادان*.

wanted to write something ¹ At that time it entered his mind that he should again perform his ablutions and then begin to write. He got up and went to a place for easing nature. As there was no one in the house I drew myself close to the seat and wrote down this couplet from the *Qasida Burda*. What has happened to your eyes that when I ask them to stop weeping they start weeping more vehemently than before? What is wrong with your heart that when I order it to be calm it gets more excited? on a piece of paper which the *ta'ir* had brought out for writing on. Then I dragged myself back ² to my own place and tears went on flowing from my eyes. After a little time when the *ta'ir* again sat down in his place and wanted to write something on the paper he saw that a couplet was written on it. He looked round on all sides of the place. As he saw no one there he turned to me and said: Did you write this? I said: Yes. Then he asked me about my circumstances. When I told him my father's name he got up and removed the chain from my feet and put his own dress on me and immediately mounting his horse went to the audience hall of the Mirza and placed me before the latter's eyes and spoke to him about my father. The Mirza gave orders and his men made a search for my father and brought him. It so happened that at the time when my father was brought into the Mirza's *majlis* in a wretched condition they were talking there about the *Hidaya-i-Fiqh* (a treatise on law). The Mirza ordered that a robe of honour should be bestowed on my father and another on me. My father in spite of the distress of his mind began an address and he stated the different heads of it in such a way that the people who were present became charmed and fascinated. The Mirza in that very *majlis* asked my father to undergo

¹ There are some differences in the readings. One MS has حنری بنوسد followed by دران حال بخاطر رسد که بعدد و صرع نموده بنوسن بردارد. The other MS and the lith ed have بخاطر رسد که بعدد و صرع نموده حنری بنوسد while the lith ed of Firishtah is slightly different from either of these. I have adopted the reading in the first MS.

² The couplet is from the *Qasida* called *Al Burda* by Bu'iri.

³ One MS has بنوسم مقام حرد while the other and the lith ed have بنام حرد.

the trouble of accompanying him, and he ordered his officers that whatever the Maulānā should have lost should be restored to him, and if the whole of it could not be found the price of that portion should be paid to him. My father said to him in reply, 'The days of life have come to an end. It is now time for my undertaking the journey to the other world and not of accompanying you', and ¹ in the end what my father had said, came to pass, for after two months he was united with the proximity of the mercy of God."

In short, when the citadel of Multān was captured, Mīrzā Shāh Husam made over Sultān Husam to the guards, and treated Shaikh Shujā'-ul-mulk Bukhārī with much contumacy, and extorted large sums of money from him, ² till he came to an end in this matter. When the ruin and desolation of Multān reached a point, that no one could even think that it would again become populous and flourishing, the Mīrzā, considering the further administration of the affairs of Multān an easy matter, left a man of the name of Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn to guard it, and making Langar Khān his assistant returned towards Thatha. Langar Khān having encouraged men from all places again restored Multān. He combined with the people of the place and removed Khwājah Shams-ud-dīn ³ bodily and took independent possession of the place.

When His Majesty Firdūs Makānī departed from the world, and the position of the Sultān of the great country of Hindūstān devolved on his Majesty Jinnat Āshīānī, the latter made over the country of the Punjāb to Mīrzā Kamrān as his *jāgīr*. The latter sent some of his men and summoned Langar Khān to wait upon him. When the latter arrived at Lāhōre, and was honoured by being allowed to wait on Mīrzā Kamrān, the latter bestowed the territory of Bābal ⁴

¹ There are some differences in the readings. One MS. and the lith. ed. have *اخر انچنان شد که بدر گفته بود*. The other MS. has *و مدگفت که انچنان شد*. I consider the latter the better reading and have adopted it, and this has been followed in the text edition.

² The words are *تا بر سر این کار رفت*, the meaning of which is not very clear.

³ Here again as in several previous passages the word is *حواله دار*, the meaning of which I cannot find out.

⁴ *نایل* in the text-edition.

on him in exchange for Multan. He also appointed a place at the extreme end of the inhabited part of Lahore for the residence of Langar Khan. This place is now known as the *Darrah* of Langar Khan and has become one of the residential areas of the city of Lahore. From this time Multan again came into the possession of the Sultans at Delhi. After the death of Mirza Kamran it descended to Sher Khan and from him to Salim Khan and from them to the agents and servants of His Majesty the Khalifa Ilahi as each of the e has been mentioned in its proper place.

A final statement—In a description of the countries ruled over by the servants of His Majesty let it not remain concealed that the length of the country which is to day in the possession of this powerful State from Hindu Koh on the borders of Badakhshan to the country of Orissa which on the further side of Bengal from the west to the east is ¹one thousand and two hundred Akbar Shahi *larohs* by the *Ilahi* yard measure which is equal to one thousand six hundred and eighty *larohs Shara* and its breadth from Kashmir to the ²hills of Bardah which are at the extreme limit of the country of Sorath and Gujrat is eight hundred *larohs Ilahi* another breadth from the Kumayun hills to the boundary of the country of Decern is one thousand *larohs Ilahi*. The whole of this land is fit for cultivation. In each *laroh* there is a certain number of inhabited and cultivated villages. At present there are three thousand and two hundred towns and one or two or ³five hundred or a thousand villages appertuin to each of these towns. The produce of this country is to day ⁴six hundred and forty *lrors* of *muradi tankas*. Out of these there are one hundred and twenty great cities which are now well populated and flourishing. As the particulars of the towns cannot be

¹ One MS omits the length by the Akbar Shahi *laroh* and gives it only by the *Shara* *laroh*.

One MS has *کوة بردہ* the other has *کوة بروحة* while the lith ed has *کوة بربرہ*. The text edit on has adopted the reading *کوة بردہ*.

³ The lith ed ends abruptly at *فانصد* five hundred only.

⁴ One MS gives the produce at *چهل کروڑ دنگہ و چہار ادب و سصد ہزار* while the other has *سصد و چہل کروڑ دنگہ*. I cannot make out what *ادب* means.

contained in this brief account the particulars of the city will be given and ¹ will be written in alphabetical order, if the Great God so wills

¹ The sentence as given in the text is what it is in one MS. In the other MS instead of حواعد شد it has شد , and then کذاب اکبر شاهی and after that بعون ملک الوهاب عز اسمه, which may be translated 'Finish Here is finished the history book Tabaqāt i-Akbar Shūhī, by the help of the Lord of all gifts, may His name be honoured'

(END)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABDUL HAK ABID—*The Riyazu s Salaf n of Chulam i Husain Salim* Persian text (Calcutta 1890-1898)
- ABDUL WALI—*The Bahmani Dynasty* *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal (N.S.)* V p 463 (1910)
- ABDUL WALI—*The Spelling of Babar's Name* *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal (N.S.)* XIV pp 453-456 1910
- ABDUS SALAM—*Ria u s Salafin*—A History of Bengal by Chulam Husain Salim English translation (Calcutta 1902-04)
- ABU TURAB ALI (Mir)—*A History of Gujarat* Edited with introduction and notes by F. Dennison Ross (Calcutta 1909)
- AHMAD ALI and ABDUR RAHIM—*Akbar nama* by Abul Fadi Allami Persian text (Calcutta 1873-86)
- BAYLEY E. C.—*History of Gujarat (The Local Muhammadan Dynastic)* (London 1886)
- BEALE THOS. WILLIAM—*Oriental Biographical Dictionary* (Calcutta 1881)
- BEVERIDGE A. S.—*The Baburnama in English (Memoirs of Babur)* Vols I and II (London 1901)
- BHATTASALI N. K.—*Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultans of Bengal* pp 1-111 1-184 (Dacca Cambridge 1902)
- BLOCHMAN H.—*Contributions to the Geography and History of Bengal (Muhammadan Period)* *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal* XLII pt 1 pp 209-310 (1873)
- BRIGGS J.—*History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India till the year A.D. 1612* Translated from the original Persian of Mahomed Kasim Ferishta Vols I-IV (London 1819)
- BROCKELMANN CARL—*Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* Vol I (Weimar 1898)
- CODRINGTON O.—*Coins of the Bahmani Dynasty* *Numismatic Chronicle* 3rd Ser Vol XVIII
- DAMES MANSEL LONGWORTH—*The Book of Duarte Barbosa* Vols 1 and 2 *Hall Soc* 1918 1919
- DE B.—*Tabaqat i Akbari* by Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad Persian text Vols I II (Calcutta 1913-7 1931) English translation Vols I II (1927 1936)
- DE B. and M. HIDAYAT HOSAIN—*Tabaqat i Akbari* by Khwajah Nizamuddin Ahmad Persian text Vol III (Calcutta 1935)
- DUFF JAMES GRANT—*History of the Mahrattas* (London 1873 Calcutta 1912)
- ELPHINSTONE M.—*The History of India—The Hindu and Mahometan Periods* 7th edition with notes and additions by F. B. Covell (London 1889)
- ELLIS N. and ROSS E. D.—*The Tarikh i Rashidi—A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia* (London 1890)
- ELLIOT H. M.—*History of India as told by its historians* Edited by John Dowson 8 vols (London 1867-77)

- FORBES, A K —*Rās Mālā*, or Hindoo Annals of the Province of Gozerat in Western India, 2 vols (London, 1856)
- HAIG, T W —The Chronology and the Genealogy of the Muhammadan Kings of Kashmīr *Journ Roy Asiat Soc*, pp 451-468 and a table (1918)
- HAIG, T W —Some Notes on the Bahmanī Dynasty *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal*, 1904, Part 1, *Eṣṭha No*, pp 1-15
- HAIG, T W —The Muntakhab al-Lubāb of Khāfi Khān Persian text, Vol III (Calcutta, 1925)
- HAIG, WOLSELEY (SIR)—*The Cambridge History of India*, Vol III, Turks and Afghans (Cambridge, 1928)
- ILĀHDĀD, M —Zafar-nāma by Shatafu'd-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī Persian text (Calcutta, 1885-88)
- The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol XII Enmo to Gwalior (Oxford 1908)
- The Imperial Gazetteer of India* Vol XXII, Samadhūla to Sīnghāna (Oxford, 1908)
- JARRETT, H S —*The Aīn-i-Akbarī*, by Abul Fazal-Allāmī Translation, Vol III (Calcutta, 1891)
- KHWĀJAH NIZAMUDDIN AHMAD —*Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* Persian text Lithograph edition, Nawal Kishore Press (Lucknow, 1875)
- KING, MAJOR J S —History of the Bahmanī Dynasty *Ind Antiquary*, 1899
- LANE-POOLE, S —The Mohammadan Dynasties—Chronological and Genealogical tables with historical introductions (London, 1925)
- LEES, W N, KABĪRU'D-DĪN AHMAD and AHMAD 'ALĪ —Muntakhab al-tawārīkh by 'Abdu'l-Qādir Badāunī Persian text (Calcutta, 1864-69)
- LEES, W N, S AHMAD KHĀN and KABIR AL DĪN —Tārīkh-i Feroz shāhī by Ziaa al-Dīn Barnī Persian text (Calcutta, 1860-62)
- MAHTER, E —Wustenfeld-Mahler'sche Vergleichungs Tabellen der mohamedanischen und Christlichen Zeitrechnung (Leipzig, 1926)
- MULL, SIR WILLIAM —Annals of the Early Caliphate from original sources (London, 1883)
- The Rāja Taranginī*, A History of Cashmīr, consisting of four separate compilations —
- (i) The Rāja Taranginī, by Kalhana Pandita, 1148 A D,
 - (ii) Rājāvalī, by Jona Rāja (defecture), to 1412 A D,
 - (iii) Continuation of Same, by Srivara Pandita, 1477 A D,
 - (iv) The Rājāvalī Pātaka, by Prajya Bhatta, brought up to the conquest of the valley by the Emperor Akbar (Calcutta, 1835)
- RAVERTY, H G —The Mihrān of Sind and its tributaries, a Geographical and Historical Study *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal*, LXI, pt 1, pp 155-508, 9 plates (1892-93)
- RODGERS, C J —The square silver coins of the Sultāns of Kashmir *Journ Asiat Soc Bengal*, LIV, pt 1, pp 92-139, 3 pls (1885)
- SCOTT, J —*History of Deccan* (London, 1794)
- SEWELL, R —A Forgotten Empire (Vijayanagar) (London, 1900)
- SEWELL, ROBERT and DIKSIT, S B —Indian Calendar (London, 1896)
- STEIN, SIR AUREL —Kalhana's Rājataranginī, Vols I, II (Westminster, 1900)
- STEWART, C —*The History of Bengal* (London 1813)

- Tarikh Farishtah* Persian text Lithograph edition Nowal Kishore Press
Vols I II (Lucknow 1884)
- THOMAS T.—The chronicles of the Pathán Kings of Delhi (London 1871)
- TODD J.—Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan of the Central and Western
Rajpoot States Vols I II Second edition (Calcutta 187–1879)
- VILĀYAT HUSĀIN.—Tārīkh-i Fīrozshāhī by Shams-i Sirāj Afif (Persian text)
(Calcutta 1888–91)

INDEX

TO THE

THIRD VOLUME

OF THE

TABAQĀT I AKBARĪ

[The numbers refer to the pages n or note means footnote Names which occur more than once on a page are entered only once in the Index Sanskrit names are not separately indexed

The index is divided into two parts

I PERSONS II GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES]

I PERSONS

A

Abdal Bhat his advice to Yusuf Khan p 753
 Abdal Khan his promise to Husain Khan p 740 a message from Yusuf Khan p 759 was attacked by Yusuf Khan and slain p 753
 Abdal Makri son of Ibrahim Makri p 693 his support of Iskandar Khan p 694 was honoured and reinforced by Babar p 696 his advance towards Kashmir and message to Malik Kaji p 697 became vazir of Nazuk Shah p 698 his share in the division of Kashmir p 699 defeated Malik Kaji p 700 showed friendship towards Malik Kaji p 701 his defeat by the Kashgharis and flight p 702 his fight with the Kashgharis p 703 disagreement with Malik Kaji p 705 created disturbance in Hamraj p 706 sent a petition to Humayun p 707 joined Mirza Haidar and his death p 708

Abd ul haq Shaikh p 621
 Abd ul lah Malik reported about the treachery of the conspirators to Mahmud Shah and was asked to bring elephants to the darbar pp 239 40
 Abd ul lah Mulla Pakli was given to him by Mirza Haidar p 712 he was slain by the rebels p 715
 Abd ul lah Shah p 701
 Abd ul lah Jangal Shaikh his tomb visited by Muzaffar Shah he was called *Pandey Brij* in the time of Raja Bhoj p 299
 Abd ul mulk Malik attained martyrdom p 296
 Abd ul mulk Saiyid Khan brought the family of Haibat Khan to Islam Khan p 713
 Abd ul qadir Khwajah teacher of Mulla Ud in music p 657
 Abd ul qadir Shahzada see Nasir ud din Sultan Sultan of Malwa
 Abd ul wahab Haj p 798

'Abd-ur rahmān, Mirzā, joined Mirzā Haidar, p 716, direction of Mirzā Haidar about him, p 717, his release, p 722

'Abd-ur-Rahmān Jāmī, Maulānā, 108

'Abd Zīnā, wanted to take away Yūsuf Khān, p 683, released Muhammad Shāh, p 690

Abū-ul Fath, Hakīm, p 628

Abul Khair, Shāh, was left in Karnāl by Ahmad Shāh to collect tribute, p 196, was sent with Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p 213

Abu-ul-ma'ālī, Shāh, his arrival and advance towards Kashmīr, p 734, his defeat by the Kashmīris, p 735

Abū Sa'id, Mirzā, sent an ambassador to Mahmūd Khālji, p 541

Abū Sa'id, Sultān, his presents to Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, p 659

Abū Turāb, Mīr, was enlisted in the band of the loyal servants of Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, p 413

Ādam Kakhar, requested Mirzā Haidar to pardon the offences of Daulat Chak, p 712

Ādam Khān, son of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, his conquest, p 663, pursued Hājī Khān, p 664, his rule, p 665, his revolt, p 666, his attack and defeat, p 667, went to Nīlāb, p 668, saw his father, went to Qutb-ud-dīnpūr, p 670, came to pay a visit to his father and retired to Hindūstān, p 671, his fight, p 672, fought against Mughals and died, p 674

Ādam Silāhdār, was killed by Bahā'ul-mulk son of Alf Khān, p 247

Add-ul-mulk, imprisoned Dāūd Khān, p 219, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to meet Rāy Batāi, p 272, was sent to Mahrāsa to stop Bahādur Shāh, p 331, fled from Barōda, p 335, joined Latīf Khān, p 337, fled from the battlefield, p 341.

Adham Khān, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p 631

'Ādil Khān, commanded an army to reinforce Kājī Chak, p 708

'Ādil Khān, Governor of Asīr, nephew of Sultān Bahādur, sent a letter to Sultān Bahādur, p 344

'Ādil Khān, ruler of Asīr and Burhānpūr, his name was Malik Nasir Rāja, his rebellion and return to his country on hearing the advance of Zafar Khān, p 178, on the arrival of Ahmad Shāh he fled to Asīr, p 197

'Ādil Khān, son of 'Ādil Khān Sawāi, helped Malik Barid in acquiring the *Saltanat* from Sultān 'Āla ud-dīn, p 133

'Ādil Khān, son of Hasan Khān, his request to Mahmūd Shāh which was accepted, p 282, was given the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn and entrusted the government of Asīr and Burhānpūr, p 284, summoned Hisām-ud-dīn, received Hisām-ud-dīn, honoured Hisām-ud-dīn with favour and permitted him to go to his camp, arranged for the murder of Hisām-ud-dīn, summoned Hisām-ud-dīn to fulfil his plan, p 286 possessed the country of his enemy sent a petition to Mahmūd Shāh with a description of the hostility of Shēr Khān and Saif Khān and the measures which were adopted to defeat the enemy, p 287, determined to invade Kālā, permitted the *amīrs* of Gujrāt to go back and returned to Burhānpūr, p 289

'Ādil Khān, son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk Turk, slew the governor of the fort of Kehrla, went with the dead body of his father to render homage to Muhammad Shāh, p 96, the fief of his father was confirmed on him by Muhammad Shāh, p 97,

besieged the fort of Birakar forgave Jay Singh Ray the territory of Jay Singh Ray was conferred on him by Muhammad Shah p 100 killed Farhad ul mulk and Malik Qiyam ul mulk shut up the Turki *amirs* in their houses and murdered them one by one p 11- informed Sultan Shihab ud din how he had dispersed the rebels p 11- defeated the rebels and requested Mahmud Shah to pardon the offences of Dastur ul mulk p 116 attacked Ram Raj of Bijanagar p 141

Adil Khan son of Mubarak Khan ruler of Asir and Burhanpur p 283

Adil Khan Faruqi ruler of Asir and Burhanpur hearing of the advance of Mahmud Shah paid him tribute and prayed to be excused p 81 joined Muzaffar Shah was sent by Muzaffar Shah to attack Rana Sanku p 304

Adil Khaniya list of Sultans p 7

Adil Muhammad was sent by Akbar to conquer Malwa p 631

Adwan Raja his representative p 634 his order to the sons of Shah Mir p 63-

Afdal Khan refused the offer of Burhan and was killed by him p 300

Afdal Khan *Majlis-i Karim* took a message to Mahmud Shah p 577 was given a title and sent to put down Mukhtaz Khan and Iqbal Khan p 580 joined Shahib Khan p 583 joined Mahmud Shah p 584 was slain by the order of Mahmud Shah p 587

Ahmad son of Nizam ul mulk Bahri his ambition his hostilities p 136 his accession declared independence period of reign p 137

Ahmad Malik son of Shih Malik revolted against Ahmad Shah p 194

Ahmad Sayid was summoned by Mahmud Khan p 50

Ahmad Sultan of Bangala p 433 succeeded his father died period of reign p 434 (and n 1 p 433)

Ahmad Sultan of Cujrat p 394 his name was Razi ul mulk *amir* gave him the title of Ahmad Shah he was placed on the throne by Imdad Khan who acted as Sultan and kept the (boy) Sultan under confinement went to Sayid Mubarak Bukhari fought with Imdad Khan and was defeated p 39- wandered in the jungle saw Imdad in his confinement attack of Imdad Khan which ended in peace was murdered period of his reign p 396

Ahmad Aswad placed Sultan Hasan on the throne bestowed title of Sultan Hasan on him p 676 opposed his retirement towards India p 6 in the post of war p 679 enemy of Mahi Yari Bhat p 680 was imprisoned and died there p 681

Ahmad Ayaz Malik Muqarrab was summoned by Ahmad Shah and given the task of commanding the Tarapur battery p 206 asked permission of Ahmad Shah to attack the enemy p 207 asked Har Ray to pay tribute p 212 was sent with Shihzade Muhammad Khan by Ahmad Shah for an enquiry p 213 fought with Qadr Khan and defeated him p 214

Ahmad Aziz Malik went to Badr Ala by the order of Ahmad Shah p 193

Ahmad Jaurin was entrusted with the duty of capturing Bahram p 733 took Bahram to Srinagar received a title p 734

Ahmad Kanbū, Shaikh, Ahmad Shāh took advice of him, p 191

Ahmad Khān, was sent by Mahmūd Khālji to crush Rāyzāda of Kehrla, p 540

Ahmad Khān, son of Ghazī Khān, was sent to conquer Tibet, p 738, his fight with the Tibetans, p 739, his promise to Husain Khān, p 740, defeated Sankar Chak, his plans against Husain Khān, p 741, his imprisonment, p 742, was blinded, p 744

Ahmad Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Hūshang Shāh, was pardoned by Mahmūd Khālji, was confined in the fort of Islāmābād by Mahmūd Khālji, his rebellion, confronted Tāj Khān, p 499, refused to act according to the precepts of Ā'zam Humāvūn, was poisoned and died, p 500

Ahmad Khattū, Shaikh, pp 242, 290, 292

Ahmad Sarkējī, Malik, revolted against Ahmad Shāh, p 194

Ahmad Shāh, son of Mahmūd Shāh, was placed on the throne by Malik Barīd, the name of *bādshāh* was nominally added to his name, the *amīrs* lived independently in his reign, p 132, period of his reign and death, p 133

Ahmad Shāh, son of Tātāi Khān, i.e. Sultān Muhammad Shāh, Sultān of Gujrāt, sent the army which was summoned by Firūz Shāh, p 43, sent a *farmān* to Shāhzāda Zafar Khān to help the Musalmān Rāys of Mahām, p 50, sent a message to Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī to leave the fort of Tanbūl, p 54, was sent to recover Mālwa by Muzaffar Shāh, made the country of Dhār over to Sultān Hūshang, p 187, was placed on the throne

by Muzaffar Shāh, and given the title of Nāsir ud-dīn Ahmad Shāh, p 188, accession to the throne, favours for the people, Firūz Khān became envious of his greatness, conferred the post of *iazir* on Jivan Dās Khattry, rebellion of Firūz Khān, p 189, advanced towards Bahrōj, satisfied the rebels by sending a message to them, hearing the advance of Sultān Hūshang marched to the village of Wantaj, Bhikam Ādam Khān Afghān, p 190, met Ahmad Shāh, sent 'Imād-ul-mulk in advance to engage Sultān Hūshang, Hūshang went back in shame, taking the advice of Shaikh Ahmad Kanbū founded the city of Ahmadābād, various material foundations in Ahmadābād, p 191, second rebellion of Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān, arrived in the town of Wantaj to destroy the rebels, sent Fath Khān in advance, Fath Khān joined Sayyid Ibrāhīm Nizām the *Jagirdār* of the town of Mahārāsa, advanced towards Mahārāsa, on arrival in the vicinity of Mahārāsa sent a message to Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān which was not responded to, sent another message to Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān p 192, Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān replied to the message stating that they would withdraw the idea of enmity when Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik Ahmad 'Aziz, Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk, and Saif Khwājah would come and give them assurance of safety, ordered the above-mentioned *amīrs* to proceed to the fort of Mahārāsa, Badr 'Alā and Rukn Khān had Malik Nizām-ul-mulk and Malik Sa'id-ul-mulk seized and imprisoned in the fort, hearing the

treachery of the enemies attacked the fort defeated the rebels Firuz Khan and the Raja p 103 of Idar fled Rannal seized the treasure of Firuz Khan and sent it to the Sultan returned victorious to Ahmadabad p 104 sent Latif Khan with Malik Nizam ul mulk to punish Malik Shah Malik advanced to crush Sultan Hushang sent Malik Imad ul mulk Samargandh to fight with Sultan Hushang from Bandhu on the retirement of Sultan Hushang Shah Malik attacked Latif Khan Shah Malik could not do at the Shalida and fled to the Zamindar of Karnal thanked God and granted gifts to the people of Ahmadabad p 105 attacked and subjugated the Raja of Karnal appointed Shah Alul Khan and Sayyid Qasim as tribute collectors of Karnal returned to his capital marched towards Nadar and stopped Adil Khan sent an army to capture the fort of Tambol p 106 flight of Adil Khan victory of the fort of Tambol arrived in the vicinity of Mahrasa after reproaching the Zamindars Sultan Hushang returned to his own country p 107 nominated Mahmud Khan p 108 to recover tribute from the Zamindars of Sorath sent Malik Mahmud Barkhan and Mukhlis ul mulk to punish Na'ir Nasir prayed for pardon of his offences forgave Na'ir with favour advanced to conquer Malwa left Nizam ul mulk as the regent of the kingdom during his absence and to punish the Raja of Mandal p 109 war between the troops of Sultan Hushang and Ahmad Shah pp 109-201 besieged the hill of Champanir a petition of the Raja of Champanir p 01 to the Sultan

and its a ceptance conquered Sonkara started towards Mandu punished the inhabitants of the hill of Kantu Maulana Musa and Ali Hamid coming from Sultan Hushang p 01 prayed the Sultan not to oppress the Muliman of Malwa sent an affectionate letter to Sultan Hushang went back to Ahmadabad laid the foundation of a fort at Jinur built a line of fortification round the town of Dhamod p 03 extorted a tribute from Champanir advanced towards Sonkara and laid there the foundations of Jamia masjid p 04 hearing of the disappearance of Sultan Hushang marched towards Mandu besieged Maluwa encamped at the foot of the fort of Mandu marched toward Ujjain the division of the country among his officers Sultan Hushang entered the fort of Mandu p 05 went from Ujjain to Mandu and sat down in front of the Dhamod gate sent a firman to Ahmadabad to summon Malik Ahmad Ali advanced to Sarangpur Sultan Hushang submitted to him and agreed to pay tribute the sudden attack of Sultan Hushang on the Sultan's camp p 06 destruction caused by the attack of Sultan Hushang victory of the Sultan flight of Sultan Hushang with his army to Sarangpur pp 07-08 started for Gujrat died at Sultan Hushang outside the fort of Sarangpur advanced in the direction of Ahmadabad p 08 lived for three years in Ahmadabad for regulating the administration of his kingdom sent an army to attack Puna advanced into Idar on the bank of Himmati laid the foundation of a fort p 209 Puna till

his death, fought with the troops of Sultān, pp 210-211, advanced to Idai, Har Rāy, the son of Pūnjā, begged for the pardon of his offences, forgave Har Rāy, p 211, conferred the title of *Ṣafdar-ul mulk* on Malik Hasan, plundered Kilwāra, went to Ahmadābād, p 212, Rāja Kānhā brought a force from Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and ravaged parts of Nadarbār Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān fought a battle with the Dakinī troops and gained the victory, p 213, Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān fought with Sultān 'Alā-ud dīn of Deccan and became victorious, pp 213-214, on the petition of Qutb, the officer in charge of the island of Mahām sent Shāhzāda Zafar Khān to destroy Malik-ut-tujjār, one of the *amīrs* of Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, Zafar Khān defeated Malik-ut-tujjār, pp 215-216, Zafar Khān took possession of Mahām and divided it among the *amīrs*, Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī marched against the country of Baglāna, postponed the siege of Chāmpānīr, advanced towards Nādōt, after plundering Nādōt encamped in the vicinity of Nadarbār, Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, on the arrival of the Sultān, had left a detachment on the boundary of his kingdom and had gone back to Gulbarga, turned back towards Ahmadābād, crossed the Tāptī after successive marches, p 217, Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī besieged the fort of Tambōl, advanced towards Tambōl, encouragement and assurance of reward by Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī to his soldiers, advanced towards him, Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī started to meet him, a conflict between Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī,

p 218, Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī took the path of flight, entered the fort of Tambōl, started towards Tālnīr, gave directions to Malik Tāj-ud-dīn and conferred a title on him, returned to Ahmadābād, marriage of Shāhzāda Fath Khān, the story of the siege of the fort of Tambōl, p 219, invasion of the Deccan, advanced to conquer the countries of Mewār and Nāgōr, encamped in the town of Dūngarpūr and Ganēsā, Rāja of Dūngarpūr and Ganēsā paid tribute to the Sultān, ravaged the country of Kilwāra, invaded Dilwāra, raised to the ground the palaces of Rānā Mūkul, p 220, left Malik Mīr Sultānī for collecting *Khurāj*, turned to Rāthōrs, Rāthōr chiefs behaved with loyalty, Firūz Khān offered tribute, gave back the tribute, returned to Ahmadābād, p 221, advanced and took possession of the greater part of Mālwa, intention to place Shāhzāda Masa'ūd Khān on the throne of his ancestors, plague attacked the army and made him return to Gujrāt, gave hopes of help to Masa'ūd Khān, date of his death, p 222, period of his reign, place of his tomb, title after his death, p 223, was sent by Sultān Muzaffar to help Sultān Hūshang, p 470

Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, Sultān, with Firūz Shāh succeeded in regaining the hereditary dominion from Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, p 27, he performed feats of valour when Sultān Firūz Shāh was fighting with Deo Rāy, p 34, prophecy of Sayyid Muhammad Gisūdarāz about his sovereignty, p 38, attempt by the adherents of Firūz Shāh to seize him, Firūz Shāh attempted but could

not crush him p 40 he was declared by Firuz Shah to be the heir of his throne p 41 (and al note 3 p 40) succeeded his father assumed the title of Sultān Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī entrusted the run of the government to the hands of Shīr Malik p 4 being aware of the insult of Naīr ud dīn awarded mortal punishment to Shīr Malik returned the army of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī p 43 advanced towards Bijanagar p 44 commenced to ravage Bijanagar Deo Ray sent gifts and asked pardon for his offences forgave Deo Ray sent a friendly *farman* to Deo Ray came back to the capital granted promotions to the *amirs* allowed the *amirs* to retire to their *hūda* sent a proposal to Naīr Khān of Naīr for the marriage of his son Al ud dīn welcomed the guests of Naīr p 4 summoned the Qazis and the great men of the city arranged the marriage assembly sent back the sons and the adherents of Naīr Khān advanced towards Tilang p 46 certain forts were reoccupied took tribute from the Kalantars and returned to Gulbarga advanced to punish the Ray of Māhur defeated the Ray and took possession of every thing belonging to him p 47 appointed Shahzada Ala ud dīn to be the heir apparent and made Muhammad Khān over to him conferred the country of Mahur with its dependencies on Shahzada Mahmud Khān gave the fort of Raipur with its surroundings to Daud Khān p 48 appointed Khalf Hasan Arab entitled Malik it tujjar to conquer the island of Maham p 49 the Musalman Rays of Maham went to ask help from

the Sultān of Gujrāt sent Shāhzada Ala ud dīn to reinforce Malik it tujjar p 50 marched towards the territory of Nar Singh Ray which was invaded by Sultān Hushang besieged the fort of Kehrā after defeating Sultān Hushang arrived in the city of Bidar p 50 selected the city of Bidar for his capital laid the foundation brick of the fort planned a grand mansion for the palace p 53 marched to capture the fort of Tanul Sultān of Gujrāt sent a message to lay the fort of Tanbul in the possession of its owner withdrew his forces from the fort p 54 went to Gulbarga became ill gave counsel and directions to Shihzāda Ala ul lā p 55 his death period of reign p 6 (and see note 1 page 56) sent Sultān Al ud dīn and Khān Jalāl to fight with Shihzāda Muhammad p 13 despatched forces to strengthen Malik it tujjar p 16 marched against the country of Baglāna hearing the arrival of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī went back to Gulbarga p 217 besieged the fort of Tambol encouraged his soldiers to fight the army of Gujrāt fought the army of Gujrāt p 218 was defeated and fled from Tambol p 219 rejected the request of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī was defeated and destroyed by Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī p 20 Ahmad Shāh Malik was sent to reconnoitre the roads p 50. Amana p 140 Ain ud dīn Malik no of the adherents of Mahmud Shah p 239 was given a title of Nizam ul mulk by Mahmud Shāh p 24

- 'Am-ul-mulk, Mahmūd Shāh sent him to take charge of the fort of Panāla and its neighbourhood, p 123, from Panāla he was sent to the island of Goa for its possession, came back, and presented Malik Sa'id to the Sultān, properties and territories of Bahādur Gīlānī were conferred on him, p. 126
- 'Am-ul-mulk, joined Nāsir Shāh, p 567
- 'Am-ul-mulk, Hakīm, came to 'Alī 'Adil Khān from Khālifa'-i-Ilāhī, p 163
- 'Am-ul-mulk, Malik, waited on Muzaffar Shāh, attacked the town of Mahrāsa, fight against the Rāja of Idar, took the path of flight, p 296, was given money by Muzaffar Shāh, p 297
- 'Ajab Dēō, Rāja of Jammū, reinforced Malik Yārī Bhat, p 680
- Ajhī, Malik released Muhammad Shāh, his rank in the court of Fath Shāh, his ability, p 690, was put to death by the sons of Ibrāhīm, p 691
- 'Ālām, Shāh, p 327
- 'Ālam, Sultān, ruler of Kālpī, complained to Sultān Bahādur against the cruelty of the army of Jinnat Āshīānī, p 367, reinforced the army of Gujrāt, p 373, was hamstrung by the order of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p 375
- 'Ālam Kālpīwāl, Sultān, was appointed to govern Rāisīn by Sultān Bahādur, p 616
- 'Ālam Khān, defeated Sankar Chak, p 742
- 'Ālam Khān, son of Jām Bāyazīd, an account of his insult in the court of Sultān Mahmūd, p 801, wounded Sultān Mahmūd, his flight to his father, went to Shōr, p 802
- 'Ālam Khān, son of Sultān Sikandar Lūdī Bādshāh of Dehli, his representation to Muzaffar Shāh about the cruelty of Sultān Ibrāhīm, p 319
- 'Ālam Khān, Khānzāda, the father of Nāsir Khān of Asir, p 57, was placed on the throne of Asir and Burhānpūr by Malik Hisām-ud-dīn Maghūl, p 283, advanced towards Burhānpūr, p 284
- 'Ālam Khān Lūdī, struggle with Daryā Khān, p 387, defeated Daryā Khān and took up the post of *vazarat*, p 388, fled to Shēi Khān, p 389, joined Sultān Ahmad, p 395
- 'Ālam Shāh, Malik, surrendered his *thāna* to Mahmūd Shāh, p 284, was given the title of Qutb Khān, and was sent in attendance on A'zam Humāyūn, p 285
- 'Ālam-ul-mulk, shut himself in Daulatābād, Hasan gave safe conduct to him, p 8
- 'Alā-ud dīn Shaikhzāda, was sent with presents to Mīrzā Abū Sa'id by Mahmūd Khālji, p 541
- 'Alā'-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla met Mukhhs in battle and slew him, assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā'-ud-dīn, attacked Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn and put him to death, succeeded Sultān Fakhr-ud dīn, left a *thāna* at Lakhnauti, advanced towards Bangāla, p 420 (and notes 1-2, p 420), was slain by Malik Hājī Ihyās 'Alāī, period of reign, p 421
- 'Alā-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded Muzaffar Shāh Habshī, showed favours to the *amīrs*, p 442 (and note 2, p 442), raised his special servants to high ranks, removed the *pārls*, summoned learned men, made efforts for enriching the country, allotted many villages for defraying the expenses of the alms houses, came every year

from Ekdala to Panduah his reign
death period of reign p 443

Ala ud din Sulṭān son of Ahmad
Shah Bahmani Ahmad Shah ap-
pointed him as the heir apparent
and made Muhammad Khān over
to him p 48 went to reinforce
Malik ut tujjar came back un-
successful p 50 heard the counsels
and directions of his father p
succeeded his father and gave him-
self the title of Ala ud din Shah
entrusted the reins of the govern-
ment to Diliwar Khān p 6 sent
Khālḥ Hasan Malik ut tujjar to
oppose Nasir Khān sent Shahzada
Muhammad Khān p 58 to conquer
Bijanagar advanced to punish
Muhammad Khān on receiving the
information of the death of Malik
Imad ud din defeated Muhammad
Khān p 9 sent a *farmā* and
conferred Mouzah Riyas on Shah-
zada Muhammad Khān p 60
returned to the capital p 61
nominated Diliwar Khān to conquer
Kokan sent *farmans* to the *amirs*
on the frontier to join Diliwar Khān
p 66 distinguished Diliwar Khān
for conquering Kokan and the first
of Rihāl turned against Diliwar
Khān p 64 received the informa-
tion of plundering by the Rāj of
Bijanagar p 64 advanced towards
Bijanagar besieged the fort of
Mudkal excused the Rāj of
Bijanagar made an agreement and
returned to the capital arranged a
great entertainment and conferred
distinctions on the *amirs* p 69
came to save Mahur from the hands
of Mahmud Khālḥi and Sikandar
Khān became victorious granted
honour to the *thanadar* of Mahur
gave him the title of Fakhr ul
mulk and confirmed him in the

government of Mahur after making
arrangements for the government of
Mahur returned to capital forgave
the offences of Sikandar Khān and
exalted him p 71 his character
and nature p 71 direction and
precepts to his son p 73 his death
p 75 period of reign p 76 was
sent by his father to fight with
Shahzada Muhammad of Gujarat
p 77 arrived at Daulatabad
received reinforcements before after
the battle p 211

Ala ud din Sulṭān son of Mahmud
Shah was made the *balshah* after
the death of Ahmad Shah by Malik
Barid planned to follow his great
ancestors in opposition of his plan
Malik Barid in concert with Nizam
ul mulk Inad ul mulk and Adil
Khān dethroned him the period of
reign which was passed in confine-
ment was one year and eleven
months p 133

Ala ud din Sulṭān son of Sulṭān
Shams ud din Sulṭān of Kashmir
reception imprisoned the Raturis
laid the foundation of a city p 639
made a rule for unchaste women
period of reign p 640

Ala ud din Hasan Shah p his
rise in Daulatabad p 3 his decla-
ration as a descendant of Bahman
p 4 came to Delhi p 7 went to the
presence of Shaikh Nizam ud din
Dehlawi who predicted his future
turned towards the Dakin killed
the superintendent of Gulbarga
and possessed its neighbouring
tract went to Daulatabad gave
saf conduct to Alam ul mulk pos-
sessed all the property belonging to
Muhammad Shah in Dirgarh
placed Isma'il Fath on the throne of
Daragarh and gave him the title of
Nasir ud din p 8 on the arrival

- of Muhammad Shāh marched away towards Gulbaiga, slew 'Imād-ul-mulk, p 9, went to Daulatābād, placed himself on the throne, assumed the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, made Gulbaiga his capital and changed its name to Hasanābād, his illness, his advice to his son Muhammad Khān, p 10 his death, period of reign, p 11 (and see note 4 on page 9, and note 1 on page 10)
- 'Alā-ud-dīn Suhriāb, Malik, fled from Sultān Mahmūd and waited on Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, was given the title of 'Alā'-ul-mulk by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 228, joined Mahmūd Khālī and was given a high rank and title by him, p 522, went to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 523
- 'Alā-ul-mulk bin Suhriāb, Malik, was sent by the *amīrs* of Sultān Dāūd Shāh to Makhdūma-i-Jahān to bring Shāhzāda Fath Khān, brought Shāhzāda Fath Khān, p 237
- Alf Khān, son of Ulugh Khān, fled from Mahiāsa, p 279, gave the elephants in charge of Sharf-i-Jahān and went to Mandū, was not favoured by Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, came towards Sultānpūr, fought with the men despatched by Sultān Mahmūd, prayed for the pardon of his offences, waited on Sultān Mahmūd, did homage and was favoured by the latter, murdered *nāib-i-'and* for which he was imprisoned and died there, p 280, sent a message to Latif Khān to leave Chāmpānūr, p 336
- 'Alī, Hakīm, came to 'Alī 'Ādil Khān from Khālifa'-i-Ilāhī, p 163
- 'Alī, Malik, was slain in the battlefield, p 703
- 'Alī 'Ādil Khān, succeeded his father, p 162, he blinded Tahmāsp and Ismā'il, his character and habits, he brought Amīr Fath-ul-lah Shirāzī and made him his *vakīl*, his possessions, his war with Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, his relation to Khālifa-i-Ilāhī, p 163, he included the name of Khālifa-i-Ilāhī in the public prayers and the coins of his realm, his religious inclinations, demanded the eunuch of Malik Barīd, Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk attacked Barīd, he reinforced the army of Barīd, Malik Barīd sent his eunuch to 'Alī 'Ādil Shāh, his welcome of the eunuch, was killed by the eunuch, the period of his reign, p 164
- 'Alī, Shaikh Mīr, his share in Kashmīr, p 699, was slain in the battlefield, p 703
- 'Alī Bēg, Shaikh, as the commander of the army of Abdāl Mākri, p 696, his representation to Mīrzā Kāmran, p 700
- 'Alī Chak, was slain by Bibī Rābe'a, p 723
- 'Alī Chak, son of Naurōz Chak, his faith in Shāh 'Ārif, his protest to 'Alī Shāh, went to Husain Qulī Khān and returned to Kashmīr, p 749
- 'Alī Hamadānī, Mīr Sayyid, his *Khān-qāh* was burnt by the Kashmīrīs, p 685
- 'Alī Hāmid, p 202, his request to Ahmad Shāh not to fight with Sultān Hūshang, p 203
- 'Alī Khān, was sent with a letter and presents to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī by Sultān Mahmūd Khālī, p 455
- 'Alī Khān, father of Yūsuf, his release from Mubārak Khān, his imprisonment by the Kashmīrīs, p 755
- 'Alī Khān, uncle of Nasir, was sent with a tribute to Mahmūd Khālī by Nasir Shāh, p 512, went as a messenger of

Vahmud Khalji to Mahmud Sharqi p 516 fought against the troops of Konbha p 599 his dismissal p 562

Ali Khan Raja was ordered to help Burhan advanced to support Burhan fought a battle sent Burhan to Ahmadnagar p 158

Ali Khan Saavid joined the army of Humayun p 39 slew Yusuf Khan and Bajji Bhat collected soldiers to fight his enemies p 683 was banished from Kashmir p 686

Ali Kokah was appointed in the place of Malik Luli p 745

Ali Makri took a message to Mirza Haidar p 714

Ali Mubarak Malik see Ala ud din Sultan of Bangala

Ali Shah brother of Husain Sultan of Kashmir his reply to Husain Khan p 747 advanced towards Srinagar came to Husain Khan's house assumed the title of Ali Shah and the duties of royalty devolved upon him p 748 his faith in Shah Arif Dariesh obtained divorce for his daughter representation of Al Chak seized Ali Chak p 749 sent troops against Ali Chak ambassadors for Akbar sent the daughter of his nephew for the service of Sultan Salim public prayers and the coins of Kashmir were adorned with the name of Akbar forgave Yusuf Shah sent an army to invade Kishtwar went with his family to see Jamalnagar p 750 famine in Kashmir p 751 repented of his sins occupied himself in performing religious duties his death p 59

Ali Shah Sultan son of Sultan Sikan dar Sultan of Kashmir after the death of Siyich Bhat selected Shahi Khan for the post of viceroy went to

the Raja of Jammu p 650 a belief of the Indians his defeat period of reign p 652

Ali Shah Begi joined Muhammad Shah p 692

Ali Sher his struggle with Sultan Jamshid p 638 his imprisonment p 757

Ali Sher Jam ruler of Sind account of his government p 775

Ali Sher Malik sent to the fort of Raisin with Silhadi p 366

Ali Shahr Aq Quyunlu Mir p 167

Ali Tahir p 639

Allahabad Mir arrival in Multan p 803

Alp Khan Sanjar Deputy of Sultan Ala ud din Khalji p 204 (and also n 2 on p 203)

Amin Khan Churi seized the fort of Junagarh and Sorath p 398

Amin Nasir brought Silhadi by deceit p 356 was sent to bring Silhadi by Sultan Bahadur p 610

Amin ul mulk father in law of Mir Tahir p 153 his decision his proclamation was put to death p 154

Amir son of Abd ul lah his plan for the invasion of Sind p 764

Amir Khan went with a message of peace to the Kashmiris p 718

Amir Mahmud Barki joined Fruz Khan p 189 was directed by Ahmad Shah to command the force p 200

Amir Zina Ahmad Jaurin came to his house in search of Bahram p 734

Amman complained to Rana Murshid p 554 was sentenced to death p 564

Anar Jam ruler of Sind account of his government p 73

Anchha Malik his plan to place Shahzada Uthman Khan on the throne of Hushang p 489 was

- pardoned by Mahmūd Khaljī, was given a fief by Mahmūd Khaljī, his rebellion, p 499, was attacked and killed with all his men by the Gōnds, p 500
- Ankas Khān, foster brother of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk, p 152, was imprisoned by Mīrzā Khān, p 153
- Ankī, fought with the Saiyids, p 684, obtained release and fought against Muhammad Shāh, p 688, treatment by Muhammad Shāh, his rank p 689, his execution, p 693
- Āīāish Khān, was sent with a message to Mēdinī Rāy by Mahmūd Shāh, p 597
- ‘Arif *Daṛūsh*, Shāh, married the daughter of ‘Alī Shāh, faith of others in him, his flight, his imprisonment, divorced his wife, p 749
- Arjun, p 633
- ‘Arz-ul-mulk, his son was slain in the house of Qadr Khān, p 336
- Asad Khān, devastated the country of the Rāys of Kokan, p 67
- As‘ad Khān, advanced from Junīr, joined Malik-ut-tujār, p 97, made Mallū Khān the Sultān, his repentance, went to Malkāpūr, p 162
- Asad Khān Lūdī, on the advance of Sultān Ibrāhīm he fled from Sanbal, p 451
- Asad Khān Rūmī a *valī* of Murtada Nizām Shāh, had an interview with Pishiau Khān, p 148
- Āsaf Khān, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to punish ‘Ālam Khān and Hīsām ud-dīn, took Malik Lādan Khaljī with him and waited upon Sultān Mahmūd, p 284, was killed by Burhān, p 390, was appointed by Sultān Bahādur to guard Mahmūd Shāh, made a martyr of Mahmūd Shāh, p 614
- Āsaf Khān Gujrātī, was left with a large force by Muzaffar Shāh to reinforce Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, pp 306, 605, his son was slain in a battle with Bhīm Karan Pūrabia, p 307, attained martyrdom, p 607
- Ashja‘-ul-mulk, Malik, fought with Udaya Singh, p 314
- Āshti Khān, was the title of Nizām Mufarraḥ, p 173
- ‘Askarī, Mīza, was sent by Humāyūn and defeated ‘Imād-ul-mulk, p 376, was appointed to the government of Ahmadābād by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p 377, relinquished the country of Gujrāt, p 378, was left in Gujrāt by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p 616
- ‘Atan, Malik, defeated Yakān Khān, p 560
- Aūhad Khān, was sent with tribute to Mahmūd Khaljī by his father, p 520
- Aūhyā, Shaikh, was sent by Bihjat Khān to Mahmūd Shāh to ask for pardon of his offences, p 595
- Āyāz, slave of Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī, fought with the Firangīs and defeated them, p 282
- Āyāz Sultānī, Malik, fought with the Rājputs and defeated them, p 275, stopped Muzaffar Shāh and himself wanted to proceed to crush Rānā Sānkā, p 312, was sent by Muzaffar Shāh to chastise Rānā Sānkā, a representation to Muzaffar Shāh, p 313, besieged Mandisōr, p 314, a message from Rānā Sānkā, his reply to the messenger of Rānā Sānkā, asked Sultān Mahmūd to come to his aid, p 315, *amīns* of Gujrāt plotted against him, agreed to make peace with Rānā Sānkā, a representation to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, p 316, encamped at Khaljīpūr and honoured the emissaries of Rānā Sānkā, was permitted to go

to the port of Dep sent a me sage
to Rana Sanka p 317 his death
p 318

Ā zam Humayun younger son of
Sultan Nasir ud din *see* Mahmud
Shah Sultan son of Nasir Shah
Sultan of Malwa

Ā zam Humayun Zafar Khan (Guj
rati) owing to the excessive cruelty
of Nizam Mufarrah Sultan Muham
mad Shah conferred the *jaḡir* of
Gujrat on him he started for Gujrat
encamped at the royal reservoir and
heard the advice of Sultan Muham
mad Shah p 173 titles which were
written to him by Sultan Muham
mad Shah pp 174 175 his delight
on the birth of his grandson Ahmad
Khan in the neighbourhood of
Nagor men of Kanbayat requested
him to suppress the cruelty of
Nizam Mufarrah he sent a letter to
Nizam Mufarrah p 175 the reply
of Malik Nizam Mufarrah to him
rebellion of Nizam Mufarrah a
battle between Zafar Khan and
Nizam Mufarrah death of Nizam
Mufarrah victory of Zafar Khan
p 176 he sent agents to all the
parganas he advanced towards
Asawal came back to the neigh
bourhood of Pattan the death of
Sultan Muhammad Shah the dis
obedience of the Raja of Idar he
advanced to punish the Raja of
Idar crushed the Raja of Idar
p 177 took tributes from the Raja
of Idar advanced towards Somnath
advanced towards Nadarbar to
punish Malik Nasir Raja Ādil Khan
returned to Pattan invaded Jar
and Tar advanced for the destruc
tion of Somnath his behaviour
towards the Rajputs and their
temples arrival at Somnath and his
activities came back to Pattan

heard the tyranny of the Rajputs
of Mandalgarh p 178 he marched
towards Mandalgarh to take revenge
for the tyranny of the Rajputs he
crushed the power of the Rajputs
made them humble and excused
their offences he performed a
pilgrimage to the tomb of Shaikh
Khawajah Mu in ud din Hasan San
jari and plundered the towns of
that country his march towards
Dandwana plundered Dilwara and
Jalwara returned to Pattan p 179
issued an order for the rest of his
troops pp 179 180 Tatar Khan came
from Delhī to Gujrat owing to the
violence of Mallu Khan Tatar Khan
prayed his father to help him
in taking revenge from Mallu
Khan Mirza Pir Muhammad
Khan possessed Multan and seized
Sarang Khan arrival of Tamur in
the neighbourhood of Delhī he
comforted Tatar Khan and post
poned the march to Delhī he and
Tatar Khan advanced towards Idar
plundered the country of Idar
and disgraced the Raja p 180
returned to Pattan after the
attack of Amir Tamur people
fled from Delhī to Pattan flight
of Sultan Mahmud from Delhī to
Gujrat he disgraced Sultan Mahmud
his victorious advance to Idar his
successful march to suppress the
Hindus of Somnath p 181 he
demolished their temples laid the
foundation of Jamī mosque and
appointed the religious servants
returned to Pattan Tatar Khan
asked favour of his father to
take back the dominion of Sultan
Mahmud from Mallu Khan he
instead of agreeing with the idea of
Tatar Khan made him his successor
to the throne p 182 grieved at the

- death of Tātār Khān, transferred Shams Khān Dandānī to replace Malik Jalāl Kōkhar, again ascended the throne after the death of Tātār Khān, p 184
- Ā'zam Khān, was sent by Khalifa-i-Ilāhī to conquer the Deccan, returned without accomplishing anything, p 157
- Azdar Khān, son of Alf Khān, it was reported to Mahmūd Shāh that he was the murderer of Qaisar Khān, order of his arrest issued by Mahmūd Shāh, later order of his release, p 271
- 'Aziz Khammār, caused rebellion in Gujrāt, p 2
- 'Aziz Khān Nāmī, brought a letter from Ahmad Shāh to Nasir Khān of Asir containing the proposal of marriage of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, p 45
- 'Aziz Khān Turk, offered to sacrifice his life for Mahmūd Shāh, p 114
- 'Aziz-ul-lah, Maulānā, p 798, was invited by Jām Bāyazīd, p 804
- 'Aziz-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to punish Malik Hīsām-ud-dīn and 'Ālam Khān, p 284
- Āzurī, Shaikh, p 53

B

- Bābā Khalīl, effected a peace between 'Idī Zinā and the Kashmīrīs, p 722, took a message to Abdāl Khān, p 752, was sent by Saiyid Mubārak Khān to the latter's enemies, p 754, his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p 760
- Bābā Mahdī, his determination about Yūsuf Khān, p 760
- Bābāi *Bādshāh*, Firdūs Makānī Zahīr-ud-dīn Muhammad, encamped in the neighbourhood of Delhī, p 321, having slain Sultān Ibrāhīm Lūdī

- possessed Delhī, p 444, Radī-ul-Mulk came to him, p 610
- Bachhrā, Rāyzāda, his flight, p 766
- Badeh, Malik, son of Nizām ul-mulk, p 269, after the death of his father he was given the title of Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk by Mahmūd Shāh, p 271
- Badī Alangdār, Saiyid, he was appointed by Mahmūd Shāh for guarding the road and for the bringing in of provisions, p 273
- Badīl, went to conquer Dēbul but attained martyrdom, p 764
- Badī'-uz-zamān, Mirzā, p 781
- Badr 'Alā', Malik, instigated Firūz Khān and Haibat Khān to revolt against Ahmad Shāh, made arrangements to defend the fort of Mahrāsa, message of Sultān Ahmad to him, his reply to Ahmad Shāh, p 192, his treachery with the *amīrs* of Ahmad Shāh, he was executed by Ahmad Shāh, p 193
- Badr Khān, came into the city and offered congratulations to the murderers of Changēz Khān, p 409
- Bahādur, Sultān, Gujrātī, Sultān of Mālwa, details of his reign in Mālwa, p 615
- Bahādur Bhat, was asked by Ghazī Khān to bring his son on the right path, p 736
- Bahādur Gilānī, account of his rebellion, took forcible possession, oppression in the ports of Gujrāt, plundered ships of Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī and imprisoned his men, after a great battle arrested Kamāl Khān and Safdar Khān and sent them to Dābul, p 117, wrote an improper reply to Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī, p 119, fight with the army of Sultān Mahmūd near the fort of Mirich and its result, p 120, sent Khwājah Na'amat-ul-lah Tabrizī in order to ask pardon of his offences,

p 191 revolted and was defeated by Mahmud Shah p 12 his men joined Sultan Mahmud fled from Kolapur sent Khwajah Na amat ul lah Tabrizi with a petition to Sultan Mahmud p 123 petition was granted but he himself changed his resolution p 141 was killed by Zain Khan p 15

Bahadur Khan agent of Jam Nanda p 778

Bahadur Khan son of Khan Zaman joined his father p 743 was slain p 744

Bahadur Khan Shahzada his petition to Muzaffar Shah for the increase of his allowance went to Ahmadabad from there to the country of Mal p 30 visited the tomb of Khwajah Mu in ud din Hasan Sanjari and went towards Delh fought with the Maghul soldiers p 321

Bahadur Shah Sultan of Gujrat at the invitation of Imad ul mulk invaded the Deccan p 135 arrived in the neighbourhood of Ahmadnagar encamped at Kalachabutra p 139 started for Gujrat p 330 a letter to Taj Khan his successful advance p 331 left Ahmadabad with great pomp p 332 sat on the throne raised the standard of empire his generous bestowal pleased every one advanced towards Champaur p 333 halted at the town of Sahvunj army crossed over the river Mahandri after crossing the river advanced towards Champaur p 334 ordered Na r Khan to seize Imad ul mulk sent Taj Khan to attack Imad ul mulk and himself mounted to follow him the house of Imad ul mulk was pillaged and his sons were taken prisoner sentenced Imad ul mulk and Saif ud din to death appointed

Shamsher ul mulk to seize Add ul mulk and Nizam ul mulk to attack Muhafiz Khan p 335 sentenced Baha ul mulk to death all the murderers of Sultan Sulandar were put to death p 336 pleased all people by his generosity p 337 coronation in the capital of Gujrat bestowed wealth and honours on the people Chazi Khan was appointed to the government of Nadarbar and Sultanpur sent orders for Latif Khan's destruction p 338 arranged a festive assembly a famine too place endeavoured to ameliorate the condition of the *raiyats* movements of disturbers sent Ulugh Khan p 339 against Latif Khan Taj Khan reported to the Sultan the hostile attitude of Ulugh Khan and Qasir Khan arrest of the conspirators ordered release of the conspirators p 340 ordered the payment of *Sulahdars* allowances news from Ghazi Khan about the battle and arrest of Latif Khan sent Muhib ul mulk to bring Latif Khan appointment of beadsmen at his brothers tombs p 341 wanted to advance against the Raja of Mal Taj Khan opposed it and soothed the Sultan sent an army with Taj Khan for the punishment of Ray Singh p 342 Taj Khan ravaged the country of Ray Singh sent Taj Khan to arrange the affairs of Kanbayet dismissed the *darogha* of Kanbayet conquered the countries of Idar and Bakar returned to Champaur went to rebuild the fort of Bahroj p 343 after finishing the work went to Kanbayet travelled to Dip by road invited the *firangis* to accept Islam a letter from the governor of Asir p 344 an order was issued in

reply to the governor of Āsīr, advanced to conquer the Deccan, encamped for the collection of troops in the town of Barōda, Jām Firūz joined the Sultān, p 345, fixed a stipend for Jām Firūz, promised to restore his dominion to Jām Firūz after recovering it from the Maghūls, powers from the various directions came and joined, representation from 'Imād-ul-mulk, decided to invade the Deccan, allowed Ja'far Khān to visit Ahma-dābād, p 346, returned to Muhammadābād and passed the rainy season there, marched towards Bākar and Idar, sent Khudāwand Khān and 'Imād-ul-mulk from Khānpūr to Bākar, proceeded towards Kanbāyet, embarked in a ship for the Dīp, showed kindness to Rūmīs (Turks), p 347, arranged residences for Rūmīs and returned after recommending them to the favour of Malik Ayāz, on his arrival at Chāmpānīr 'Umr Khān, Qutb Khān, and amīrs of Sultān Ibrāhīm fled to Gujrāt and were exalted to high ranks, penetrated into Bākar by successive marches, arranged for the better government of Bākar, p 348, acceded to the prayer of Ratan Sēn, laid the foundation of a mosque, gave Karchī to Prithī Rāj, divided the territory of Bākar between Prithī Rāj and Jagā, p 349, bestowed favours on Sikandar Khān and Bhūpat, a message from Sultān Mahmūd, p 350, reply to the message of Sultān Mahmūd, marched towards Bāns-wāla, arrived at Sambla, waited for ten days for Sultān Mahmūd, p 351, on arrival at Dībālpūr came to know that Sultān Mahmūd wanted to confer the title of Sultān

Ghiyās-ud-dīn on his eldest son and had no desire to meet Sultān Bahādur, started and encamped at Sūd-pūr, arrived at Na'leha and made arrangements for the siege, p 352, sent the Pūrabīa contingent to Pahalwānīa, took up quarters in the palaces at Muhammadpūr, captured the fort of Mandū, p 353, ascended to the top of *La'l Mahal* and sent a man to wait on Sultān Mahmūd, received Sultān Mahmūd with respect and tried to please him, took up his residence, p 354, at Mandū, gave permission to amīrs to go back to Gujrāt, went to see Burhānpūr and Āsīr, conferred on Nizām-ul-mulk Dakinī the title of Muhammad Shāh and returned to Mandū, ordered the release of Musalmān women from the disgrace of *Kufr* and condign punishment for Silhadī, sent Muqbal Khān to Chāmpānīr to guard the fort sent Ikhtiyār Khān with troops and treasure, made proclamation of his departure to Gujrāt, p 355, went to Mandū to make preparations for the march towards Gujrāt, left Ikhtiyār Khān in charge of the government of Mandū, gave permission to Bhūpat to bring Silhadī, advanced towards Ujjain, went away to Dībālpūr, Banharīa and Sa'dulpūr for hunting, p 356, started from Sa'dulpūr for Dhār, talked with the amīrs about seizing Silhadī, took up his residence in the fort of Dhār, sent 'Imād-ul-mulk to attack Bhūpat, started towards Ujjain, conferred the government of Ujjain, p 357, on Daryā Khān, bestowed Sārangpūr on Mallū Khān, gave permission to Habib Khān to go back to Āshta, marched towards Bhilsa and Rāīsīn,

on arrival at Bhulsa came to know about the currency of heathenism there p 358 waited at Bhulsa for three days for the erection of mosques and houses for pious purposes advanced to conquer Raisin attacked *Purabia* Rajputs p 359 forbade continuance of the fight and postponed it to next day marched from Rai in and commenced the construction of covered passages representation from Silhadi for submission and acceptance of Islam p 360 acceding to the request of his brother Silhadi asked leave of the Sultan for evacuating the fort granted leave to Silhadi and waited Silhadi was permitted to go to the fort Silhadi advised the Rajputs of the fort p 361 fight between the son of Silhadi and the army of Gujrat ordered imprisonment of Silhadi in the fort of Mandu became violent on hearing the news of the Rana's approach sent Muhammad Khan and Imad ul mulk Sultan for their chastisement p 362 Muhammad Khan and Imad ul mulk submitted a report to the Sultan describing the advance of Rana with a large force on the report of Imad ul mulk hastened towards Kahrar report of the spies of Rana about the arrival of the Sultan p 363 fight of Rana and Bhupat pursued the enemy p 364 leaving the punishment and castigation of the Rana to the next year returned to Raisin and after arrival there made the siege closer than before terms and conditions of Lakhman for evacuating his fort for the Sultan granted Lakhman's prayer and summoned Silhadi from the fort of Mandu

detailed a body of soldiers to guard the fort p 365 sent Malik Ali Sher with Silhadi to the fort enthusiastic speech of Rani Durgawati made Silhadi ready for revolt p 366 fatal end of the rebels granted the fort of Raisin and Chanderi and the territories of Bhulsa as a *jagir* to Sultan Alam appointed Muhammad Khan to capture the fort of the Kakrun started on an expedition to hunt elephants made Kanur over to Ulu Khan took possession of Islamabad and Hushangabad and the whole of the country of Malwa granted these possessions as *jagirs* to the *amirs* of Gujrat p 367 arrived towards Kakrun occupied himself in Kakrun in a festive assembly sent Imad ul mulk and Ikhtiyar Khan to capture the fort of Mandisor forts of Mandisor and Kakrun came into the Sultan's possession advanced from Mandu to Champanr p 368 advanced towards Dip on being informed of the power of *firangis* advanced towards Chitor siege of the fort of Chitor sporadic fights of the Gujratis and their victories submission of the Rana to the Sultan cause of hostility with Humayun Badshah conferred favours on Tatar Khan p 369 spent money for collection of troops p 370 letters from Humayun Badshah which were not satisfactorily responded to Humayun Badshah advanced to crush the Sultan advanced to seize the fort of Chitor p 371 took the fort of Chitor met Humayun Badshah in the vicinity of Mandisor opinion of the *amirs* of the Sultan p 372 preparations for war with the Mughals reinforcement by Alam

- Kālpīwāl, p 373, exhaustion of the Gujrātīs, fled towards Mandū, Humāyūn Bādshāh pursued him to the fort of Mandū, shut himself up in Mandū, p 374, flight from Mandū to Chāmpānīr, sent the treasure and jewels which he had at Chāmpānīr to the port of Dīp and himself went to Kanbāyet, taking strong horses went on to the port of Dīp, p 375, distribution of the treasures of the Sultān, deputed 'Imād-ul-mulk for collecting the revenue, p 376, rebellion over the whole of Gujrāt, p 377, advanced into Gujrāt, relinquishment of Gujrāt by the *amīrs* of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p 378, advanced towards Chāmpānīr to crush Tardī Bēg Khān, halted at Chāmpānīr for arranging the affairs in that neighbourhood, advanced towards Sōrath and Junāgarh to enable the *fīrangīs*, who had been called for help, to return, p 379, arrival of the *fīrangīs* at the port of Dīp, successful conspiracy of the *fīrangīs* caused the death of the Sultān, p 380, port of Dīp in the possession of the *fīrangīs*, period of reign, p 381
- Bahār Khān, the command of the fort of Ranthambhōr was transferred from him by Mahmūd Khālījī, p 520
- Bahā'-ud-dīn, was welcomed by Yūsuf Khān, p 759
- Bahā'-ud-dīn, Malik, one of the adherents of Mahmūd Shāh, p 239, he was made Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk by Mahmūd Shāh, p 242
- Bahā'-ud-dīn 'Imād-ul-mulk, Malik, he was sent to the *thāna* of Sonkhir by Mahmūd Shāh, p 263, by taking an oath on *Qur'ān* he gave assurance to Rāy Rāyān not to disclose the secrets of his treachery to Mahmūd Shāh and promised to assist him in carrying out his intention, had a talk with Malik Miyān, wrote a letter to Malik Farhat-ul-mulk to meet him, sent a letter to Malik Qiyām-ul-Mulk forbidding him to march from Rakhīāl, sent for Muhāfiz Khān and gave him special directions, p 265, advised Mahmūd Shāh to go to Ahmadābād, addressed the *amīrs* in regard to the reply to the question of Mahmūd Shāh, p 268, inquired the cause of silence of Mahmūd Shāh, reported the whole story of conspiracy to Mahmūd Shāh who sent him to conquer Jālōr and Sājōr, encamped near the tomb of Shaikh Hājī Rajab, p 270, informed Mahmūd Shāh what was done by Mujāhid Khān, his death, p 271
- Bahā'-ud-dīn Quraishī, Shaikh, went as an ambassador to Mirzā Shāh Husam, p 805
- Bahā'-ud-dīn Zakariyā Multānī, Shaikh, p 788
- Bahā'-ul-mulk, helped 'Imād-ul-mulk in placing Nasir Khān on the throne, p 328, joined Sultān Bahādur, p 332, was hanged by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p 336
- Bahā'-ul-mulk (son of Alf Khān), killed Ādam Silāhdār and fled to Idar, p 247
- Bahlūl, Maulānā, went as an ambassador to Mirzā Shāh Husam, p 805
- Bahlūl Lūdī, Malik, was sent by Sultān Muhammad to fight against Mahmūd Khālījī, p 510
- Bahlūl Lūdī, Sultān, Bādshāh of Dehlī, asked help of Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī, p 460, asked favour of Sultān Husam, defeated Sultān Husam, sent *Malikah-i-Jahān* to Sultān Husam, p 461, requested Sultān Husam to be pardoned,

- defeated Sultan Husam on every occasion took possession of Jaunpur and established his son there his death p 46
- Bahram Raja raided Indarkot p 716
- Bahram Chak son of Regi Chak reached Srinagar p 709 went to Haibat Khan Niyazi p 713 his share in the division of Kashmir p 719 was seized by Idi Zina p 721 defeated the Niyazis p 723 his imprisonment p 720 was granted favours by Ghazi Khan p 73 joined the rebels p 733
- Bahram Khan p 16 Bahram Khan and Govind Ray rose in revolt the Sultan started towards Deogarh arrived in its neighbourhood they became afraid and went to Daulatabad to Shaikh Rukn ud din the great Sufi of the time p 17 the Sultan on hearing of this arrived at Daulatabad and went to visit the Shaikh and agreed to pardon them they went away to Gujrat p 18 was sent by Mahmud Shah to meet Ray Batai p 17
- Bahram Khan son of Sultan Zam ul abidin welcomed Haji Khan p 668 his treachery p 670 in the service of Haidar Shah his jagir p 673 went towards Hindustan p 676 arrived in the district of Karma p 677 his defeat his death p 68
- Bahram Khan Khan Khanan respected Nasrat Chak p 736
- Bahrun entered the service of Sultan Bahadur p 346
- Baji Bhat was slain p 683
- Balal son of Imad ul mulk Tawalak his murder p 799
- Bandagan Kohal was nominated to crush the rebel p 709 was left by Mirza Haidar at Srinagar p 710 fought with the Kishtwara army as the commander of Mirza Haidar's troop p 711 was slain p 712
- Baqi Beg Khwajah the fort of Sihwan was made over to him p 779
- Barbak Shah Sultan of Bangala the amirs seated him on the throne passed his time in pleasure died p 435 (and see notes 2 3 p 435) period of reign p 436
- Barbak Shah Sultan of Bangala after murdering his master took the title of *badshah* p 438 (and see n 1 p 348) his pomp and strength was slain period of reign p 439
- Barbak Shah son of Bahlul Lodi the government of Jaunpur was given to him by his father after the death of his father he advanced to conquer Delhi being defeated by Sultan Sikandar he fled to Jaunpur p 462 went to conquer Multan p 793 possessed the fort of Khanwal p 790
- Barid Malik imprisoned Sultan Kalim ul lah in the city of Bidar p 4 was appointed as the *lotual* of Sultan Shihab ud din p 11 was informed about the intention of Dilawar Khan kept the Sultan in imprisonment p 113 became all powerful in administration kept Mahmud Shah as a puppet met with the army of Imad ul mulk Kawil p 131 placed Ahmad Shah on the throne of Mahmud Shah and kept him in confinement p 132 placed Ala ud din in place of Ahmad Shah dethroned Ala ud din p 133 placed Sultan Wahullah in place of Sultan Ala ud din poisoned Wahullah on account of the latter's wife after Wahullah gave the name of Sultan to Kalim ul lah p 134 had a fight with Imad ul mulk

- Kāwālī, made submission to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt, p 135, his eunuch was demanded by 'Alī 'Adil Khān, was attacked by Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk, asked 'Alī 'Adil Shāh for help, presented the eunuch to 'Alī 'Adil Shāh p 164
- Barkhūrdār, Malik, was sent by Ghaznīn Khān to seize Zafar Mınjumla, p 487, was given the title of Tāj Khān by Mahmūd Khālji, p 497, sent a petition asking for aid to suppress the rebels, joined Ā'zam Humāyūn, p 499, fought with Malik Hājī 'Alī reassured Malik Ishāq of his good luck, p 504, was sent by Mahmūd Khālji with a message of peace to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 525, fought against the army of Kōnbhā, p 529, captured the fort of Būndī, p 532, defeated Rāyzāda of Kehrla, p 540
- Barkhūrdār, Sayīd, was sent by Sayīd Mubārak Khān with a message to the latter's enemies, p 754
- Basant Rāy, was entrusted with the administration by Mahmūd Shāh, p 576, was slain by the *amīrs*, p 577
- Batāi, Rāy, fought with Malik Sadhā and killed him with his followers, plundered the army of Malik Sadhā, on the arrival of Mahmūd Shāh he repented of his shameful deed and asked for pardon of his offences his ambassadors were turned back by Mahmūd Shāh, p 272, sent tribute to Mahmūd Shāh which was refused, asked Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn Khālji to help him, p 273, fought with Qawām-ul-mulk and his troops and made martyrs of them, p 275, was captured and brought to Mahmūd Shāh, was made over to Muhāfiz Khān to recover his health, was urged by Mahmūd Shāh to accept Islām, refused and was executed, p 276
- Bāyazīd, Jām, joined Sultān Husam, p 795, his love of learned men, p 796, his engagement with Sultān Husam, p 799, seized 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak, his appointment as *vazīr*, raised Mahmūd to the throne of Multān, p 800, disposition of Sultān Mahmūd towards him, his order for the punishment of the turbulent men of Multān, p 801, sent his son to Shōr, defeated the army of Sultān Mahmūd, his petition to Sultān Sikandar, p 802, peace with Sultān Mahmūd, p 803, granted favours to Mir Jākar Zand, his invitation to Maulānā 'Azīz-ullah, p 804
- Bāyazīd Saikhā, Malik, was sent with a message to Mahmūd Khān, p 494, his suggestion to the *amīrs* to deal with Mahmūd Khān, p 495
- Bāz Bahādur, son of Shujā' Khān, Sultān of Mālwa, took possession of his father's property, p 628, sent his mother to Daulat Khān, distribution among the heirs of Shujā' Khān, treacherously slew Daulat Khān, took possession of Mālwa, declared himself as the Sultān with the title of Bāz Bahādur Shāh, advanced towards Rāisīn, defeated Malik Mustafā, advanced towards Kadrūlā, p 629, took possession of Kadrūlā, invaded Katinkah but was defeated, occupied himself in pleasure and enjoyment, p 630, was defeated by the servants of Akbar, his character, period of reign, went to Gujrāt, p 631, went to the Rānā of the fort of Kōnbhal-mīr, was enrolled in the band of Akbar's servants, his death, p 632
- Bhāgmatī, she was loved by Muhammad Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk, p 171

Bhagwan Das Raja was sent to invade Kashmir p 760 made peaceful settlement with the Kashmiri p 761

Bha i Khan p 173 his resolve his proclamation was put to death p 154

Bharru p 136 (and see also n p 136)

Bhawanidas son of Shekhar brought his daughter as a tribute to Na ir ud-din p 10

Bherodās took a letter to Bihjat Khan p 589 reported all the talk of Bihjat Khan to Mahmud Shah p 590

Bhikam Adam Khan Afghani p 190 attended on Ahmad Shah and was received with favour p 191 revolted against Ahmad Shah p 191

Bhim p 481

Bhim Ray fought with Latif Khan p 341

Bhim Ray Raja of Beyt wali the chief of Beyt was captured by Mahmud Shah he took the path of flight p 261 was seized and sent to Multan for hanging and the announcement of his death p 6

Bhim Karan Pirabai fought with Sultan Mahmud Khan p 307

Bhupat waited on Sultan Bahadur and was favoured p 30 asked Sultan Bahadur to go to Ujjain to bring Siliadi p 30 his flight with Rana of Chitor p 364

Bhupat son of Siliadi went to Burhanpur with Sultan Bahadur p 610 went to Chitor p 610 possessed the fort of Rai in and its neighbourhood p 617

Bihar Mal joined Nizam ul mulk was sent with Nizam ul mulk by Muzaffar Shah to recover Ilar p 300

Bilushki Mir a Sayid hal Fattu in his house p 149

Bihjat Khan was entrusted with the government of Chandri p 208 his reply to Mahmud Shah p 83 sent his son to attend on Mahmud Shah p 24 was summoned by Mahmud Shah p 248 his reply to Mahmud Shah submitted a petition to Sultan Sulandir Iul p 249 proclaimed Shah Khan as the Sultan p 29 sent an army to capture Srangpur p 93 prevailed for the pardon of their offence to Mahmud Shah and was promised favours his dishonour with Shah Khan p 90 Mahmud Shah was favoured by the latter p 96

Bir Raj Raji of Ilar was rewarded by Mahmud Khan p 2

Birbal Raj p 10

Birkha Ray could not withstand Muhammad Shah Jahari and paid tribute to him p 10

Birha Barber was hanged by Haidar Shah p 63 caused the death of Hasan Kachhi p 64

Birha the prisoner of Sultan Mahmud of Gujarat description of the murder of Sultan Mahmud committed by him p 38 murdered Asaf Khan and Khudawand Khan p 390 murdered Afzal Khan his proclamation for the throne was slain by Sherwan Khan p 391

Birhan ud din Qutb Alam Shaikh p 34

Burhan Nizam ul mulk son of Ahmad succeeded his father Shah Tahir came from Iraq to the Deccan p 13 adopted Imami religion p 138 Sultan Bahadur Gyrati advanced to conquer the Deccan and encamped at Kalichabutra Burhan did homage to him Sultan Bahadur

respected Shāh Tāhūr Burhān had the public prayer read and coins struck in his own name, ruled for forty-eight years, p 139, married Āmina, a prostitute and Husain Nizām-ul-mulk was born of her, p 140

Burhan Nizām-ul-mulk son of Husain Nizām-ul-mulk escaped from prison, was defeated by the *amīrs* of Murtada, went to Khalifa-i-Ilāhī and was favourably received p 148, his entrance in the service of Akbar and start towards Berār p 156 possessed the country of Berār the duration of his imprisonment and escape came to Gujrāt, was favoured by Khalifa-i-Ilāhī and sent to Mālwa Āzam Khān was sent to free the Deccan and make it over to Burhān, came back to the court of Khalifa-i-Ilāhī was appointed to attack the Afghāns, p 157 was summoned from Bangash and sent to the Deccan, a *farmān* of Khalifa-i-Ilāhī to all concerned in support of Burhān, Nazr Bē and Rāja 'Alī Khān joined Burhān, Jamāl Khān marched from Bijāpūr to defend Burhān, date of his accession p 158

Burhān-ul-mulk, Silhādī was made over to him by the order of Sultān Bahādūr, p 362

C

Chānd Khān, son of Sultān Muzaffār Gujrātī had an interview with Bahādūr Shāh, p 330, got out of the fort of Mandū and fled p 353, after the death of his father went to Mahmūd Shāh p 610, fled from Mahmūd Shāh, p 612 Chandar, son of Rāja Rañjan, p 634 Chengīz Khān his father attacked Burhān, p 391, ports of Sōrath,

Nāgōt and Chāmpānīr were in his possession, p 398 arrived at Ahmadābād and congratulated Sultān Muzaffār p 399 sent a message to I'tmād Khān, p 400 sent a petition to the court of Sultān Muzaffār for the extension of his dominion p 401, possessed Nadarbār marched towards the fort of Tālnū, posted his army to defend Mirān Muhammad Shāh p 402 being unable to withstand Mirān Muhammad Shāh fled to Bahrōj advanced towards Ahmadābād to punish I'tmād Khān, occupied Barōda sent a message to I'tmād Khān that he should retire to his own *qāqār* p 403 advanced towards the battlefield of Ahmadābād without giving battle I'tmād Khān took the path of flight and became victorious p 404 made an amicable settlement with Shēr Khān defeated Mirān Muhammad Shāh, p 405 allotted some parganas in the Sarkār of Bahrōj to the Mīrzās as *qāqārs*, without his permission the Mīrzās began to occupy other estates sent an army to attack the Mīrzās his army was defeated by the Mīrzās p 406 asked Ulugh Khān and Jhuhjār Khān to come to him, received Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk Ulugh Khān, Jhuhjār Khān and other *Habshīs* with respect, p 407, ordered Ulugh Khān to go to the *chauqān* field, p 408, was killed by Jhuhjār Khān p 409

D

Dāhūr Rāy, his reply to Hajjāj, p 763, his fight with Muhammad Qāsim p 767, summary of the circumstances attending his death,

- p 76S fight of his v i low p 760
his daughters were sent to *Halif*
p 0
- Darī h Chak dī obev el h i brother
p his execution p 73
- Darī Mull was favoured by Zain
ul dīlīn p 661
- Darvā Khān amir of Mīra was sent
by Sultān Mahmūd lā an amba sador
to Sultān Bahadur p 350 in
f rīn el Sultān Bahadur at Sambla
that Sultān Mahmūd v a unallē
to see him on account of illn s
p 351 toll Sultān Bahadur the
real cause of his in t r s inability
to come was sent bac by Sultān
Bahadur p 3 Sultān Bahadur
conferred the government of Ujjain
on him p 35 united with
Imād ul mull an i put Ikhtiy r Khān
to death p 352 taking Sultān
Mahmūd with him advanced to v ards
Sōrath and d f ated Im d ul mull
made Sultān Mahmūd into a m re
puppet p 356 gave the title of
Sultān Muẓaffar Shāh to a boy of
unknown descent fight with Alam
Khān p 357 sought protection of
Sh r Khān Afghān p 358
- Daryā Khān of Sind v a male v r
of Jīm Firuz p 73 join l Jīm
Ṣalāh u dīn summoned Jīm Firuz
an l rā l him t t th thron his
death p 80
- Darya Khān Turk slew the governor
of th fort of Kehrā taking th
dead body of hī fath r went to
rend r homage to Muhammad Shāh
p 36 the siefs of his father were
confirmed on him and Adil Khān by
Muhammad Shāh p 97 was nomi
nated by Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī
to pursue the Ray of Orīssā p 101
seized Farhad ul mull Turk killed
Mahk Qiyām ul mull murdered
the Turkī amīrs p 112
- Dastur ul mull was d featēd by Adil
Khān at the request of Adil
Khān his off nees were pardoned
by Mahmūd Shāh p 116
- Dād th kuglōm of Sulaimān
Karār nī came under his power
was d f t l by Khān Khān n was
slam l y Khān Jahān p 116
- Dād son of Jahāngīr Makrī fought
with the Sūvils and was killed
p 684
- Dād Malik ul unarī Malik was
appoint l l y Mahmūd Khān to
cha t r t l Cond p 510
- Dād Kalār his imprisonment p 751
- Dād Khān an amir of the Dēcan
hallengēd the Gujrātī amīrs and
was tal n prīncr p 719
- Dād Khān governor of Bīyāna
mal y his submīssion to Mahmūd
Khān p 6
- Dād Khān ruler of Aīr sought
prot ction of Nāir Shāh p 70
- Dād Khān youngest s n of Ahmad
Shāh Bahmanī Sultān Ahmad Shāh
gave him th fort of Rājūr (Rachur)
with its surrounding country p
48 v a sent to his g ba p 49
- Dād Shāh cousin of Mujahid Shāh
hostility with Mujahid Shāh slōw
Mujahid Shāh a cendēd the throne
of Mujahid Shāh p 21 hostility
of th sī t r of Mujahid Shāh against
Dād Khān he v a wounded by his
mīrs who were incitēd by th
sī t r of Mujahid Shāh was carried
to the palace his enemy was
def ated his d ath period of roīgn
p (also sē n l p 2)
- Dād Shāh Sultān Gujrātī p 235
amīrs placēd Shāh z v dā Dād Khān
uncle of Quṭb u dīn Ahmad Shāh
on the throne began to commit
unworthy doēds made the promise
of conferring the title of Imād ul
mull on a farrash annoyānce of

- the *amīrs*, direction to be separated from the work of government, p 236, Malik 'Alā-ul-mulk took Shāhzāda Fath Khān to the royal palace, *amīrs* placed Fath Khān on the throne and gave him the title of Sultān Mahmūd, period of reign, p 237
- Daulat, his advice to Husain Khān p 748
- Daulat, nephew of Sultān Mahmud, helped Burhān in the murder of Sultān Mahmūd, p 390
- Daulat Chak, nephew of Kājī Chak, ignored the summons of Mīrzā Haidar p 712, went to Haibat Khān Niyāzī, p 713, his share in the division of Kashmīr, gave his fief to his son, p 719, summoned Sankar Chak p 720, marriage of his daughter, went to Sūyyapūr, p 721, joined Ghazi Khān, p 722, defeated the Niyāzīs, p 723, defeated 'Idī Zīnā, p 724, rise of his power, p 725, hostility of Ghazi Khān, p 726, sent Ibrāhīm Chak and Haidar Chak to invade great Tibet, p 727, was blinded by Ghazi Khān, p 730
- Daulat Khān p 743, conflict with Bahādur Khān, p 744, fled from Mubārak Khān, p 755
- Daulat Khān Ajīyālā, adopted son of Shujā' Khān, p 623, requested Islām Khān to pardon the offences of Shujā' Khān, p 627, was slain by Miyyān Bāyazīd, p 629
- Daulat Khān Lūdī, received the *farmān* of Sultān Sikandar, p 802, effected peace between Sultān Mahmūd and Jām Bāyazīd, p 803
- Dāwar-ul-mulk, joined Sultān Bahādur, p 332, was arrested, p 340
- Dēbā, sent troops to fight against Mahmūd Khaljī, p 512
- Deo Rāy, sent an army in the neighbourhood of Badhūl, p 32, his fight with Firūz Shāh, p 34, his submission to Firūz Shāh, p 35; his revolt against Firūz Shāh, p 38, sent gifts and presents to Sultān Ahmad Shāh and asked pardon of his offences, p 45
- Dhūalnūn Beg, Mīr his death, p 781
- Diā'-ul-mulk, saw Sultān Bahādur in the city of Chāmpānūr, p 334, was asked to convey an order to his father, p 335 was imprisoned but was released by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p 340
- Dilāwar Khān was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to reinforce Ā'zam Humāyūn, p 288, arrived at the town of Nadarbār, p 289
- Dilāwar Khān, Khān Ā'zam Khān, the reins of the government of Sultān 'Alā ud-dīn came under his grasp, p 56 was nominated by Sultān 'Alā ud-dīn to conquer the country of the Rāys of Kokan, sent Asad Khān, Fūlād Khān and Safdar Khān to devastate the country of the Rāys, p 66, forgave the Rāy of Sangesar, advanced to capture the fort of Rāhal, after much bloodshed the Rāy of Rāhal requested for pardon of his offences at the instigation of envious people Sultān 'Ala-ud-dīn turned against him, retired into a corner of safety, p 67
- Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī Sultān of Mālwa, brought Mālwa under his possession, p 467, after the downfall of Sultān Mahmūd of Dehli declared himself as the independent ruler of Mālwa, died after enjoying success and pleasures of life, views of other historians in connection with his death, p 468
- Dilāwar Khān Habshī, wounded Nizām-ul-mulk, p 112, *vakālat* of 'Ibrāhīm

Adil Khan reverted to him ran the government for nine years was attacked by Ibrahim Adil Khan p 166 fled to Burhan Nizam ul mulk and instigated him to attack Adil Khan was summoned by Adil Khan and blinded p 167

Dilawar Khan Jangju got into the fort p 569

Dilju p 636 destroyed Kashmir returned to Qandahar p 637

Dukha was placed in charge of the public affairs p 748

Dungar Sen besieged Narwar p 507 retreated to Gwalior p 508 despatched treatise on music to Sultan Zain ul abidin p 659

Dungars he was captured and brought to Mahmud Shah he was made over to Muhafiz Khan and was executed p 76

Durgawati Rani mother of Bhupat delivered an enthusiastic speech which made Silhadi ready for revolt her sacrifice pp 365-366

Durgawati Rani wife of Raja Katinkah defeated Baz Bahadur p 630

F

Fadil Beg Kokaltash was left in the fort of Bhakkar p 779

Fadl ul lah Badh Malik went in company of Tatar Khan to Nasir ud din p 557 joined Nasir ud din p 569

Fadl ul lah hakim Maulana was appointed by Mahmud Khan 519

Fakhr ud din Sultan of Bangala after murdering Qadr Khan became the master of the throne sent Mukhlis to the frontier district of Bangala p 419 (see notes -4 p 419) had no faith in his followers Ali Mubarak attacked him and sentenced him to death period of reign p 40

Fakhr ul mulk was sent to crush Muhafiz Khan p 594

Fakhr ul mulk Malik dispersed the rebels p 115 was entrusted with the management of the army by Mahmud Shah p 116 was sent to take charge of the fort of Panala p 193 destroyed Bahadur p 15 was given the title of Khan Jahan by Mahmud Shah p 16

Farhad ul mulk Turk was seized by the traitorous amirs in the time of Muhammad Shah Lashkari p 11

Farhat ul mulk reported Mahmud Shah about the messenger of Shah Ismail p 90

Farid Imad ul mulk Malik was directed to command the force in war by Ahmad Shah was summoned by Ahmad Shah p 100 fought with Sultan Hushang and defeated him p 101 was given Kantha by Ahmad Shah in his fief p 903 enquired of Malik Juna about the welfare of Ahmad Shah came for the destruction of Sultan Hushang p 10

Fath Chak raided Indarkot p 716 created disturbance p 733 joined Khan Zaman p 743

Fath Jang Khan Sherwani went to his jagir p 587

Fath Khan his flight from Ghazi Khan p 738 his fight with the Tibetans and death p 739

Fath Khan commander of Husam Khan defeated Sankar p 741

Fath Khan son of Adan Khan see Fath Shah Sultan of Kashmir

Fath Khan son of Sultan Muzaffar was sent by Ahmad Shah but joined his brothers p 19 helped to place Sikandar Khan on the throne p 323 was made over to custodians by the order of Sultan Hushang

- p 482, was sent by Muzaffar Gujrātī to chastise Mēdmī Rāy and Rānū Sānkā, p 602
- Fath Khān, uncle-in law of Bāz Bahādur, his consultation with Myān Bāyazīd, p 626, was killed, p 630
- Fath Khān, Jām, ruler of Sindh, account of his government, p 776
- Fath Khān, Shāhzādā, was married to the daughter of the Rāy of Mahām by Ahmad Shāh, p 219
- Fath Khān Balūch, p 398, was attacked by the Fūlādīs and defeated, p 399
- Fath Khān Rāfdī, put Mullā Yūsuf and Mullā Firūz to death, p 746
- Fath Shāh, Sultān of Bangāla, the *amīrs* placed him on the throne, p 437 (and see n 4, p 437), he was slain by the *pāiks* who were instigated by an eunuch who himself sat on the throne, period of reign, custom of Bangāla, p 438
- Fath Shāh, Sultān of Kashmīr, his efforts to regain his ancestral dominions, p 686, his defeat in fight advanced to conquer Kashmīr, p 687, his fight with Muhammad Shāh, defeat, victory, p 688, his order for Muhammad Shāh, accession, arrival of Mīr Shams, p 689, disputes among the *amīrs*, release of Muhammad Shāh, division of Kashmīr, his *vazīr* and *Dīvān*, an example of the judgement of Malik Ajhī, p 690, struggle between Muhammad Shāh and the latter's victory, retired to Hindūstān, period of reign accession of Muhammad Shāh for the second time, his *vazīr*, his successor, death of Malik Ajhī, victorious attack of Fath Khān, p 691, period of Sultān Muhammad's reign, Kashmīr under Fath Shāh for the second time, successful attack of Muhammad Shāh, his death and period of reign, Sultān Muhammad's accession for the third time, p 692, his *vazīr*, an example of the wisdom of Kājī Chak, execution of the *amīrs* of Fath Shāh, p 693, skirmishes between Muhammad Shāh and Iskandar Khān, Muhammad Shāh turned against Malik Kājī p 694, Malik Yārī defeated and seized Iskandar Khān, Iskandar's eyes were blinded, Malik Kājī imprisoned Muhammad Shāh and raised Ibrāhīm Khān to the throne, p 695, period of the reign of Muhammad Shāh p 696
- Fath-ul-lāh, Maulānā, p 798
- Fath-ul-lāh Shirāzī, Amīr, was brought by 'Alī 'Adul Khān, p 163
- Fattū a prostitute, her account, p 149, her power, p 150
- Firūz, Jām, ruler of Sindh, succeeded his father, made Daryā Khān his *vazīr*, hostility with Jām Šalāh-ud-dīn, p 779, account of his reign, p 780
- Firūz, Mulla, gave the order for the execution of Yūsuf, p 745, his execution, p 746
- Firūz, Sultān, son of Sultān Husam, Sultān of Multān, his accession, his *vazīr*, his nature, p 798, his envy towards Balāl, caused the murder of Balāl, his death by poison, p 799
- Firūz Khān, was asked to come to the private chamber of Mahmūd Shāh and was explained the purpose of the announcement of *Haj*, p 267, was ordered by Mahmūd Shāh to arrest Azdar Khān p 271
- Firūz Khān of Kashmīr, was slain in the battle, p 723
- Firūz Khān, ruler of Nāgōī, son of Shams Khān Dandānī, fought with Rāna Mūkul, p 194, brought some

lakhs of *tanikas* as tribute which was returned by Ahmad Shah p 2 1 news of his death p 2-9

Firuz Khan son of Sultan Muzaffar rose in revolt *amirs* united with him in rebellion went to Kanbayat used the opportunity of the unity of his brothers and advanced to wards Bahroj asked Sultan Hushang Churi to help him p 189 was favoured by Ahmad Shah p 190 revolted in 814 A H took helter in the hills of Idar asked Raja of Idar to help him p 19 fled from Ankhori to the hills of Idar fled to Nigor attained martyrdom p 194 his revolt in the country of Bahroj and request to Sultan Hushang joined Ahmad Shah p 479

Firuz Shah Sultan success in the attempt at regaining his hereditary dominions p 2 accession to the throne p 9 account of justice in his reign conquered Bijanagar p 8 advanced towards Shakar p 9 opposed by the Ray of Bijanagar defeated the Ray of Bijanagar p 30 marched to conquer the country of the Marhatta p 35 conquered Kohra and devastated its surrounding countries sanctioned the plan of a new city with the name of Firuzabad p 36 welcomed Amir Sayid Muhammad Husdaraz p 37 marched towards Arankal p 38 was wounded by the army of Deo Ray and was taken to Gulbarga p 39 asked help of Sultan Ahmad of Gujarat p 40 tried to crush Khan Khanan declared Ahmad Khan to be his heir his death p 40 period of reign p 4

Firuz Shah Sultan of Bangla the *amirs* placed him on the throne

p 439 (and see n 4 p 439) his death period of reign p 440

Firuz Shah Tuluq Sultan son of Rajab advanced from Delhi to wards Lakhnauti p 4 engaged in a battle with Sultan Shams ud din near Ekdila returned to Delhi received tribute from Sultan Shams ud din p 4 3 treated the ambassador of Sultan Shams ud din with kindness and sent Arab and Turkish horses to Sultan Shams ud din with Malik Saif ud din p 4 4 advanced to conquer Bangla in the time of Sultan Sikandar p 4 6

Fulad Khan was appointed as the governor of Bijanagar by Firuz Shah p 3 killed many soldiers of Deo Ray p 34 devastated the country of the Rays of Kokan plundered the country of Rahal p 6

G

Gadai of Rawat tribe Sayid Muhammad got into his house p 686

Gadai Malik was sent to help the men of Nagor by Sultan Qutb ud din p 230

Gajadhar fought against Mahmud Khalji and was slain p 5 9

Gane a paid a tribute to Ahmad Shah p 60 did homage to Sultan Muhammad Shah through the intervention of Malik Mir Sulṭani p 4

Gangdas sent his request to Mahmud Khalji p 51 paid tribute to Mahmud Khalji p 5

Gangdas Raja of Champaur p 257 Chadanfar fled to Sultan Bahadur and incited him to advance on Ahmadabad p 377

Ghalib Khan was ordered to destroy the palace of Nair ud din p 557

Ghazi Khan was appointed to the government of Nadarbar and Sultan

pūr, was sent with an army to crush Latīf Khān, p 338, informed Sultān Bahādūr about the hostility of Latīf Khān, p 341

Ghāzī Khān, son of Mubārak Khān of Asīr, his titles, his oppressions, asked pardon of his, p 533, offences and was excused by Mahmūd Khaljī, p 534, being defeated fled towards Elchpūr, p 538, informed Mahmūd Khaljī about the rebellion of the *Zamīndārs* of Kachwārah, p 541

Ghāzī Khān, son of Rēgī Chak, Sultān of Kashmīr, was brought before Mīrzā Haidar, p 710, went to Haibat Khān Niyāzī p 713, went to Mīrzā Haidar, p 714, his share in the division of Kashmīr, p 719, his relation with Kājī Chak, summoned Sankar Chak, p 720, his marriage, p 721, his fight with the army of 'Idī Zinā, p 722, hostilities with Daulat Chak, p 726, rose to power, his advice to Nasrat Chak, p 729, seized and blinded Daulat Chak, raised Habīb Shāh to the throne, p 730, fight with Habīb Chak, p 731, attack on his enemies, p 733, defeated Shāh Abu-ul-ma'ālī, his order for the execution of the Mughals, p 735, his tyranny, his order for his son, p 736, after defeating his enemies raised the standard of his rule, accession, p 737, pardoned his enemies, took up his residence at Lār, sent his son for the conquest of Tibet, p 738, fight with the Tibetans, period of rule, p 739, raised his brother to the throne, p 740, collected army to fight with Husam Khān, p 741, his death, p 744

Ghāzī Saiyid Khān, his fight with Sultān Husam p 792

Ghaznīn Khān, with the title of Sultān 'Alā-ud dīn, was sent by Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī against Sultān Muhammad, p 510, for further details see Qadam Khān, son of Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī

Ghaznīn Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Sultān Hūshang see Muhammad Shāh, son of Hūshang Shāh Ghūrī, Sultān of Mālwa

Ghiyās-ud-dīn, Sultān, succeeded his father, p 24, he was imprisoned and blinded by Taghaljī, period of his reign, p 25

Ghiyās-ud-dīn Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded his father with the title of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn, p 427, his life, period of reign, p 428 (and see note 4, p 427)

Ghiyath-ud-dīn, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa, p 257, advanced to help Rāy Batāī, p 273, withdrew his steps and retired to Mandū, p 274, was sent by Mahmūd Khaljī against Sultān Muhammad, p 510, entrusted with the command of the army of Sārangpūr, p 523, ravaged the surrounding places of Sūrat, p 525, ravaged the countries of Kilwārah and Dīlwārah, p 532, his accession, bestowal of Ranthambhōr upon Qadam Khān, his generosity, p 543, granted rank and title to 'Abd-ul-qādir, his statement to the *amīrs* about his activities for the sake of his kingdom, p 544, sent an order to Shēr Khān, p 546, to chastise Sultān Bahlūl, description of his faith and simplicity, his strictness in religious rites and duties, an example of his love and respect for Qurān, p 548, an incident in connection with his obedience to the laws of the Prophet, p 549, his reply to the petition of the Rāy of Chāmpānīr according to the law

of religion p 51 period of reign p 553 representation of Shuja at Khan and his order p 554 killed Malik Mahmud and Sai Das sent men to seize the murderers of Munja Baqal p 555 sent a message to Nasir ud din p 556 ordered the destruction of the Nasir Shahi palace message of Nasir Shah p 557 sent a message to Nasir ud din p 559 his effort to arrange peace among his sons p 561 destruction of his palace shifted to the palace of Sarsati p 563 recognised Nasir ud din as a Sultan p 564 news of his death 566

Gita D orah did homage to Sultan Qutb ud din and represented the forcible possession of Rana Kumbha p 31 the fortress of Abu was made over to him by Sultan Qutb ud din p 93

Gop Singh Raja his relations with Sultan Zain ul abidin p 600

Govind Ray see Bahram Khan

H

Habib gun maker Sultan Zain ul abidin wrote a book in concert with him p 657

Habib Qali went to the house of Husam Khan p 749 was injured by a *Rafdi* p 745

Habib Chak son of Daulat Chak his *jagir* his marriage p 719 his victory over the Tibetans p 727 refused to fulfil the demands of Haidar Chak p 728 his rebellion fight with Chizi Khan p 731 his execution p 732

Habib Khan governor of Ashta p 301 fled from Mandu and complained about the power and violence of Purabia Rajputs to Muzaffar Shah p 302 was permitted to go to

Ashta by Sultan Bahadur p 358 was sent to crush Muhafiz Khan p 594

Habib Khan his effort to defeat Yusuf Khan p 58

Habib Shah son of Ismail Shah Sultan of Kashmir accession agreement among the enemies of Chazi Khan p 30 definition of the *Pistis* advance of Shah Abu ul maali towards Kashmir p 734 defeat of Shah Abu ul maali execution of the *Muhtasib* p 35 was concealed in a corner p 37

Habib ul lah Shaikh was allotted the management of *Khal a parganas* p 554 killed Munja Baqal and fled to the harem of Sultan Nasir ud din p 555 fled from the palace of Sultan Nasir ud din p 56 waited on Sultan Nasir ud din p 557 despatched his ring to Nasir Shah after the victory p 563 favoured by Nasir ud din Nasir Shah conferred on him the title of *Alam Khan* p 564 went to Sher Khan p 565 was made over to the men of Sher Khan p 566 was imprisoned by Nasir ud din p 569

Habshi Hafiz his escape from execution p 135

Hafiz Malik was given the title of Muhafiz Khan by Mahmud Shah and was sent in attendance on Iqbal Humayun p 185

Haibat Khan had an interview with Firuz Khan united with Firuz Khan p 189 was sent by the *amirs* to the presence of Ahmad Shah was favoured by Ahmad Shah p 190 summoned the Raja of Idar for help p 19 joined Nasir ud din p 558 was nominated to crush Yakan Khan by Nasir ud din p 560

Haibat Khan son of Sultan Muzaffar his revolt in the country of Bahro

- and request to Sultān Hūshang, joined the troops of Ahmad Shāh, p 472, was made over to custodians by Sultān Hūshang, p 482
- Haibat Khān, son of Jām Ṣalāh-ud-dīn, his death, p 780
- Haibat Khān son of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 643
- Haibat Khān Niyāzī, settlement with Islām Khān, made proposals for peace with Mīrzā Haidar, p 713, his advance to conquer Kashmīr, was slain, p 723
- Haidar, son of Muhammad Khān, was appointed as the successor of Sultān Zam-ul-'ābidīn, p 660
- Haidar, Mīrzā, Sultān of Kashmīr, Hīmāyūn permitted him to conquer Kashmīr, p 707, possessed Srinagar, p 708, his victory over Kājī Chak, suspicious about Rēgī Chak, nominated his men to crush the rebels, p 709, advanced to conquer Tibet, seized the fort of Kōsūr, welcomed the ambassador of Kāshghar at Lār, p 710, his reply to 'Idī Zīnā, advanced from Lār to Kishtwār, skirmishes with the Kishtwārā army, p 711, advanced towards Tibet, appointed Muhsin as the governor of Tibet, granted the prayer of Ādam Kakhar, p 712, returned to Kashmīr, proposals of Haibat Khān for peace, p 713, Kashmīrīs separated from Haibat Khān, sent an ambassador to Islām Khān, sent back the ambassador of Islām Khān, appointed the governor of Baharmal, representation of the Mughals, p 714, refused to listen to 'Alī Mākri, conflagration in Indarkōt, message of Qarrā Bahādur, battle between the Mughals and the men of Baharmal, appointment of agent, news about the arrival of Mullā 'Abd ul-lah, p 715, came out of Indarkōt, the Mughals joined him and resided at Shihāb ud-dīnpūr, his encampment, destruction of Indarkōt, p 716, took up his residence in Khānpūr, the Kashmīrīs came to Adanpūr, made a will for his brother, started to attack his enemy, account of his death, p 717, flight of the Mughals, the Kashmīrīs buried his corpse, peace between the Mughals and the Kashmīrīs, period of reign, p 718
- Haidar Chak, went with 'Alī Khān, p 755, helped Lōhar, p 757, fought but was defeated by Yūsuf Khān, went to Rāja Mān Singh, p 759
- Haidar Chak, son of Ghazī Khān, his message to Habīb Chak, p 728, his execution, p 736
- Haidar Kāshgharī, Mīrzā, was sent to invade Kashmīr, p 701, fought with the Kashmīrīs, p 703
- Haidar Khān, son of Muhammad Shāh, his arrival in Nau Shahr for the conquest of Kashmīr, p 750, was deceived by Muhammad Khān Chak, p 751
- Haidar Khān, son of Yūsuf Khān, went to wait on Akbar, p 758
- Haidar Shāh, Sultān, son of Sultān Zam-ul-'ābidīn as Hājī Khān revolted against his father, p 663, his defeat, p 664, was sent for by his father, p 666, obeyed the *farmān* of his father, p 667, was made the successor of his father, p 668, his illness, p 669, was summoned by the *amīrs* to occupy the seat of his father, p 671, his accession, p 672, his heir, allotment of fiefs, character and habits, p 673, illness, p 674, death, period of reign, p 675

Haji Malik one of the adherents of Mahmud Shah p 39 made an attack on the rebels p 41 was given the title of Imad ul mulk by Mahmud Shah p 24^o was sent to Idar by Mahmud Shah induced two servants of Baha ul mulk to confess to the murder of Adam Silahdar reported to Mahmud Shah that he had brought the murderers of Adam Silahdar and Baha ul mulk had fled into Idar caused the execution of the two servants of Baha ul mulk was executed by the order of Mahmud Shah p 48

Haji Ali Malik Taj Khan and Mansur Khan fought with him p 504

Haji Kamal Malik ul umara government of Chandēri was transferred from Nasrat Khan to him p 501 rebellion in his country p 503

Haji Kashmiri Khwajah was nominated to crush the rebel Bahrin Chak p 709 went to the spot where Mirza Haidar was lying wounded p 718 one lakh donkey loads of paddy allotted to him p 719 went to Islam Khan p 720

Haji Khan did not take part in the battle between Imad Khan and the Fuladis joined the Fuladis who demanded his jagir from Imad Khan p 400

Haji Khan son of Sultan Zain ul abidin see Haidar Shah Sultan son of Sultan Zain ul abidin Sultan of Kashmir

Haji Khan Sultan was appointed to Dhar p 621 informed Shuja Khan about the advance of Mallu Khan p 623

Hajjaj son of Yusuf sent Muhammad Harun towards India p 761 his letter to Ray Dahr p 763 sent Badil to conquer Debul sent

Muhammad Qasim for the conquest of Sind p 764

Hakim Ali was welcomed by Yusuf Khan p 709

Hamid Bukhari Sayid satisfied Sher Khan by answering his question p 413

Hans Raja of Blumbar fought with the army of Tatar Khan p 68

Harari Amirzadah was removed by Sultan Mahmud from Qanauj p 40

Harju went to bring Sankar Chak p 70

Harkhu Khan his son asked help from Muzaffar Shah p 298

Har Ray prayed Ahmad Shah for the pardon of his offences p 11 was forgiven by Ahmad Shah and was taken into the circle of loyal adherents was asked to pay tribute this was delayed was pursued fled from the place p 19 presented his laughter in the shape of tribute to Muhammad Shah Muhammad Shah gave him the fort of Idar at the request of his daughter p 4

Harsinghi Ray was the Ray of Kelri who made his submission to Firuz Shah and accepted his sovereignty p 36

Hasan informed Sultan Ghiyath ul din about the raid of Bahlul Lodi p 546

Hasan son of Sher Ashumak was banished with his brother by Sher Ashmal p 642 was imprisoned by Sultan Qutb ud din p 643

Hasan Malik was given the title of Safdar ul mulk by Ahmad Shah and was left in Ahmadnagar p 21^o

Hasan Malil was sent by Chaznin Khan to seize Zafar Munjumla p 48

Hasan Sayid son of Sayid Nasir was sent for and entrusted with the reins of authority by Sultan Hasan

- turned the mind of Sultān Hasan against the Kashmīris, p 681, accepted the will of Sultān Hasan for his successor, placed Muhammad Khān on the throne of his father, was slain, p 682
- Hasan, Sultān, son of Hājī Khān Haidar Shāh, Sultān of Kashmīr, his accession, p 675, residence, entrusted the administration to Ahmad Aswad, revived the rules of Sultān Zain-ul-'ābidīn, act of mischievous persons, p 676, sent Malik Tāj Bhat against Bahrām Khān, p 677, imprisonment of Bahrām Khān and Zain Badr, p 678 enmity between the *amīrs*, disturbances created by the *amīrs*, p 680 imprisonment of Ahmad Aswad, made over the reins of authority to Saiyid Hasan, attacked by disease, made will for his heir and successor, p 681, period of reign, p 682
- Hasan 'Alī, his father, his appointment as *nāyib*, was conferred the title of Mirzā Khān, his activities as the *vakīl* of Murtada Nizām Shāh, declared Mirān Husam to be the Sultān, p 150
- Hasan 'Alī Khān, p 114
- Hasan Chak, went to Haibat Khān Niyāzī, p 713
- Hasan Dakinī, Malik, was known as Malik-ut-tujjār, Shāhzāda Zafar Khān was sent by Ahmad Shāh to destroy him, his tyranny, p 215, built a barricade along the shore of Mahām, fought with the army of Gujrāt, fled and got within the barricade, after the reinforcement of the army of Gujrāt he prayed Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī for help, was reinforced by the army of Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī and advanced towards Thāna, fought with Shāhzāda Zafar Khān and was defeated, p 216
- Hasan Gāngū see 'Alā ud dīn Hasan Shāh
- Hasan Kachhī, favoured Hājī Khān, p 671, his execution, p 674
- Hasan Khān, made strong terms of engagement with Amīrzāda Habīb-ul-lah, gained the favour of the soldiers, p 82, was deceived by Sirāj Khān, receiving a safe conduct went to the besiegers, p 83
- Hasan Khān, son of Hājī Khān, joined his father, p 672, Kamrāj allotted as his jāgīr, p 673, came to Kashmīr but was not welcomed by his father, p 675
- Hasan Khān, son of Kājī Chak, his marriage, p 721
- Hasan Khān, son of Saiyid Mubārak Khān, was slain, p 753
- Hasan Khān, son of Sultān Firūz Shāh, p 38
- Hasan Khān Shāhzāda, youngest son of Sultān 'Alā-ud dīn, was supported by Saif Khān, Mallū Khān and other *amīrs* in taking the throne of Humāyūn Khān, at the time of sitting on the throne he saw Humāyūn Khān coming to the palace, became afraid, p 75, came down from the throne, p 76, was taken to the house of one of the conspirators, p 239
- Hasan Mākri, defeated the Niyāzīs, p 723, joined Ghazī Khān, p 726
- Hasan Matū, family of Mirzā Haidar was placed in his house, p 719
- Hastī Chak, helped Lohar, p 757
- Hastī Khān, joined the enemy of Ghazī Khān, p 731
- Hastī Tariq, seized Habīb Chak, p 731
- Hātim, Malik, attained martyrdom at the hands of Rānā Sānkā, p 310

Hayat Khatun wife of Sultan Hasan of Kashmir gave birth to a son named Muhammad p 680

Hazbar Khan p 563

Hemkaran was sent to crush Muhafiz Khan p 594

Hummat Khan joined Nasir ud din p 559

Hindal see Qutb ud din Sultan son of Sultan Shams ud din Sultan of Kashmir

Hindal Mirza was sent by Humayun Badshah to crush Tatar Khan p 371

Hindu Beg Qulchin entered the fort of Mandu p 374 was sent with Mirza Askeri p 376 was appointed to the government of Baroda by Humayun Badshah p 377 relinquished the country of Gujrat p 378

Hisam ud din went to his brother Rukn ud din p 241

Hisam ud din Malik p 203

Hisam ud din Qadri went to Chimpanir from Ahmadabad for negotiations p 239

Hisam ud din Maghul Malik placed Khanzada Alam Khan on the throne of Asir and Burhanpur p 283 joined the camp of Mahmud Shah and was honoured by him p 284 was given the title of Shahryar and the moudah of Dhanura and was permitted to go back by Mahmud Shah p 285 left Burhanpur and resided in Thalpur joined Nizam ul mulk Bahri in rebellion came towards Burhanpur with four thousand horsemen came with pride to Azam Humayun was slain by Darya Khan p 286

Hisam ul mulk Handeri was summoned by Mahmud Khalji p 509

Humayun Badshah Jinnat Ashiani sent letters to Sultan Bahadur to expel Muhammad Zaman Mirza

from his dominions advanced to crush Sultan Bahadur p 371 met with the army of Sultan Bahadur in the vicinity of Mandisor p 372 pursued Sultan Bahadur to the fort of Mandu p 374 came to Bangala in pursuit of Shir Khan p 448 Sultan Bahadur came to him account of the rule of deputies in Malwa p 616 left Malwa and went to Agra turned towards Bangala p 617

Humayun Shah Sultan (son of Sultan Alam ud din) ascended the throne and appointed a wise vizier p 76 entrusted the duties of the vizier to Khwajah Najm ud din Qaran Gilani determined to march to Malikonda sent Khan Jahan in advance of himself p 77 fought became victorious returned to the capital conferred the title of Khwajah Jahan on Malik Shah p 78 sent Khwajah Jahan with Nizam ul mulk Churi to the country of Tilang and followed himself p 79 turned against Nizam ul mulk cast off the Khwajah from his favour determined on the conquest of Tilang p 80 understood the policy of Hasan Khan killed friends and strangers p 89 became a slave of lust put members of his harem to death p 84 was slain period of reign p 89

Husain Mir was slain in the battle field p 703

Husain Shah ruler of Sind account of his reign p 783

Husain Sultan son of Mahmud Shah Sharqi succeeded his brother advanced towards the country of Orissa conquered the country of Tirhut levied tribute p 469 returned to Jaunpur after victory put the fort of Benares into repair

sent *amīrs* to capture the fort of Gwāliar, advanced to conquer Delhī, seized the territory, p 460, appertaining to Delhī, rejected the request of Sultān Bahlūl, defeat by Sultān Bahlūl, p 461, refused to accept the request of Sultān Bahlūl, was defeated on every occasion, had to content himself with a section of his territory, induced Bārbak Shāh to advance on Delhī, p 462, fled and found an asylum with the ruler of Bangāla, period of reign, end of the Sharqī Empire, p 463

Husain, Sultān, son of Sultān Mahmūd, Sultān of Multān, his accession, siege of Multān by Mirzā Shāh Husain, p 806, description of Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah Lāhōrī about the siege of Mirzā Husain p 807, account of Maulānā Sa'd-ul-lah about himself after the victory of Mirzā Husain over Multān, p 808, his imprisonment, Multān under the possession of Langar Khān, p 810, Multān in the possession of the Sultāns of Delhī, a final statement by the author, p 811

Husain, Sultān, son of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, Sultān of Multān, succeeded his father, p 791, conquest of the fort of Shōr, p 792, possessed the fort of Khānāwāl, returned to Multān, brought the country as far as the boundary of the fort of Dhankōt into possession, rebellion of Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, seized Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, entered the fort of Multān, p 793, flight of the Delhī army, p 794, jāgīr conferred on Malik Suhrāb, arrival of the Balūchīs, his grants to the Balūchīs, Jām Bāyazīd and Jām Ibrāhīm entered his service, p 795, his letter to Sultān Sikandar, p 796, peace

and agreement with Sultān Sikan-dar, sent an ambassador to Sultān Muẓaffar Gujrātī, description of Qādī Muhammad about the palaces of the Sultāns of Gujrāt, speech of 'Imād-ul-mulk Tawalak, p 797, raised Firūz Khān on the throne, p 798, his lamentations after the death of his son, again occupied himself with administration, sent for Jām Bāyazīd and instructed him to avenge the murder of his son, p 799, appointment of Jām Bāyazīd as *vazīr*, his death, period of reign, p 800

Husain Arghūn, Mirzā Shāh, a *farmān* of Bābar, an ambassador of Sultān Mahmūd came to him, p 805, besieged the fort of Multān, p 806, began to destroy Multān, p 808, made over Sultān Husain to the guards, treatment of Shujā'-ul-mulk, returned to Thatha, p 810

Husain Khān, brother of Ghazī Khān, Sultān of Kashmīr, was made the commander of the army of his brother, p 735, requested Ghazī Khān to pardon the offences of his enemies, p 738, accession, p 740, divided the country of Kashmīr, sent a large force against Sankar Chak, plans for murdering him, p 741, sent a message to his enemies, imprisoned his enemies, sent a large army to attack Sankar Chak, p 742, his disposition against Khān Zamān, attack of Khān Zamān, p 743, execution of Khān Zamān, founded a college, p 744, ordered Mubārīz Khān to be imprisoned, consultation with the lawyers of Shara'iat, p 745, reply to Yūsuf's partisans, welcomed the ambassadors of Akbar, execution of the *Muftīs*, sent his daughter for the service of Akbar, p 746, illness, his message

to Ali Khan p 747 handed over government to Ali Khan died p 748

Husain Yakri was sent with Qarra Bahadur sent his brother with a mes age to Mirza Haidar p 714

Husain Nizam ul mulk (son of Burhan Nizam ul mulk) succeeded his father Burhan Nizam ul mulk p 140 attacked Ram Raj of Bijanagar with Adil Khan Qutb ul mulk and Malik Barid Ram Raj advanced to meet them with p 141 a large army p 14 Ram Raj was killed p 143 ruled for thirteen years left two sons p 144

Husain Nizam ul mulk son of Murtada Nizam ul mulk was released by Hasan was made the successor of his father by Hasan Ali p 150 Mirza Khan in his government spent his time in luxury amirs of the Deccan envious of Mirza Khan decided to get rid of Mirza Khan arrangement of a feast p 151 invitation to Mirza Khan and his refusal Saiyid Murtada Sharwani complained that he was poisoned report and suggestion of Mirza Khan to Husain Nizam ul mulk about Saiyid Murtada Sharwani his imprisonment by Mirza Khan p 152 Mirza Khan imprisoned Ankas Khan Mirza Khan sent Mir Tahir to the fort and brought Ismail out of prison Jamal Khan Gujrati and Yaqut declared war against Mirza Khan p 153 his massacre announcement about Ismail Nizam ul mulk for the succession of Husain fight of Jamal Khan and the other amirs with Mirza Khan Mirza Khan's defeat and end his period of rule p 154

Husain Quli Khan p 749

Husain Sabazwari Sultan father of Hasan Ali p 150

Hu ain Sharwani went with an army to reinforce Kaji Chak p 708

Hushang Sultan son of Dilawar Khan Sultan of Malwa invaded the country of Narsingh Ray fought with Sultan Ahmad by the side of Narsingh Ray was unsuccessful p 150 advanced to give battle to Muzaffar Shah fled to the fort of Dhur saw Muzaffar Shah p 180 was imprisoned by Muzaffar Shah p 180 was released by Muzaffar Shah p 180 was requested by Firuz Khan for help p 189 advanced from Dhur to help Firuz Khan p 190 returned to his country p 191 advanced towards Gujrat returned to his country retreat of Sultan Hushang p 190 his arrival at the town of Mahrusa could not face the army of Sultan Ahmad Shah and returned to his own country p 197 his repeated invasions of Gujrat met the army of Ahmad Shah p 199 was defeated and fled from the battlefield p 201 his offences were forgiven by Ahmad Shah p 203 left Malwa p 204 returned from Jainagar and entered the fort of Mandu p 205 went to Sarangpur and agreed to pay tribute to Ahmad Shah his attack on the camp of Ahmad Shah p 206 plundering of the camp of Ahmad Shah by his army army of Ahmad Shah met with his army and wounded him p 207 was defeated by Ahmad Shah and retired to Sarangpur fought with the army of Ahmad Shah and was defeated p 208 succeeded his father and gave himself the title of Sultan Hushang the amirs and the great men of Malwa rendered homage to him heard the news of the arrival of Sultan Muzaffar Gujrati at

Ujjan, p 468, fought with Sultān Muzaffar in the vicinity of Dhār but was defeated and arrested, army of Mālwa carried Nasir Khān out of Dhār, p 469, armies of Mālwa left Dhār and resided in the fort of Mandū and made Mūsā Khān their chief, sent a petition to Sultān Muzaffar, Sultān Muzaffar granted permission to Shāhzāda Ahmad Shāh to reinforce him, sent a man to the fort of Mandū to summon the *amīrs*, p 470, *amīrs* could not join him, went to the town of Mahēsar but could not conquer it, his cousins came out of the fort of Mandū and joined him, p 471, entered the fort of Mandū, conferred the title of Malik-ush-sharq on Malik Mughlīth and appointed him as his *vazīr* and representative, advanced to destroy the country of Gujrāt but without fulfilling his aim returned to Dhār, while Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī was attacking the Rāja of Jhālāwār he turned towards Gujrāt, p 472, could not withstand Ahmad Shāh and returned to his own country, on the petitions of the *Zamīndārs* and the Rājas of Chāmpānīr, Nādōt and Idar advanced to conquer Gujrāt but was unsuccessful and had to return to his own country, p 473, fought with Sultān Ahmad in the vicinity of Kālādah but fled and took shelter in the fort of Mandū, conferred the title of Mahmūd Khān on Malik Mahmūd and granted him a share in the government of his father, whenever he went on any expedition he left Malik Mughlīth as his deputy and took Mahmūd Khān with him, p 477, advanced towards Jājnagar, p 475, as a merchant to buy some elephants, p 476, attacked

the Rāj of Jājnagar and imprisoned him, the *vazīrs* of Jājnagar sent 75 elephants to him, returned to his own country, released the Rāja of Jājnagar, p 477, made a night attack on the army of Sultān Ahmad, p 478, fought with Sultān Ahmad and fled to the citadel of Sārangpūr, when Sultān Ahmad turned his face towards his own country he pursued him and again gave battle, but being defeated took shelter in the fort of Sārangpūr, went from Sārangpūr to the fort of Mandū, conquered the fort of Kākrūn, advanced to conquer Gwāhar and took possession of its neighbouring territory, advanced to meet Sultān Mubārak Shāh, p 479, peace with Sultān Mubārak Shāh, advanced to aid the Rāj of Kehrla, attacked Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī and fled towards Mandū, his wife fell into the hands of Sultān Ahmad who sent her to Mandū, marched to conquer Kālpī, p 480, after fighting with Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī obtained possession of Kālpī, p 481, summoned Uthmān Khān Shāhzāda with his two brothers and gave orders for their confinement, destroyed the men of Jātba, p 482, plundered the Rāja of Bhīm and went to the fort of Hūshangābād, told an allegorical story of his death to the *amīrs*, declared his son Ghaznīn Khān as his successor, p 483, gave directions to the *amīrs*, gave counsel and advice to Mahmūd Khān, some *amīrs* represented to him in favour of Uthmān Khān, his reply to the *amīrs*, p 484, he asked for his quiver and called for the *amīrs*, p 488, his death, p 490, period of reign, p 491

Hu hang Shah adopted son of Shuhab ud din was placed on the place of Sultan Shuhab ud din was attacked and fled p 581

Hushiyar ul mulk p 339

I

Ibrahim was slain p 37

Ibrahim son of Jahangir Malik persuaded Muhammad Shah to invade Kashmir his rival in the court of Muhammad Shah p 691 was imprisoned by Malik Kaji p 693

Ibrahim Jam joined Sultan Husain p 9 bestowal of Uch by Sultan Husain on him p 796

Ibrahim Sayid was seized by Ili Zina p 721 fled from custody and joined Daulat Chak p 79

Ibrahim Adil Khan son of Ismail Khan succeeded his father request of Mallu Khan to Asad Khan p 161 Mallu Khan's reign repentance of Asad Khan he imprisoned and punished Mallu Khan and Ulugh Khan fight with Burhan Nizam ul mulk period of reign p 169

Ibrahim Adil Khan son of Tahmasp when and how he ascended the throne p 160 Kishwar Khan slew Kamal Khan the end of Kishwar Khan and Mustafa Khan abolished the established form of religion establishment of a new religion Dilawar Khan as a *talil* in the administration p 166 attacked Dilawar Khan instigation of Dilawar Khan to Burhan Nizam ul mulk to attack Adil Khan summoned Dilawar Khan and blinded him period of reign p 167

Ibrahim Husain Mirza reinforced Chengiz Khan p 403 went with his brother towards Baroda and Bahroj p 413

Ibrahim Khan son of Chazi Khan his faith in Shah Arif p 749 his execution p 750

Ibrahim Khan son of Muhammad Shah see Ibrahim Shah Sultan son of Muhammad Shah Sultan of Kashmir

Ibrahim Khan Sayid p 69 as the commander of the army of Ibrahim Shah p 698

Ibrahim Nizam Sayid instigated Fath Khan to join his brothers entitled Rukn Khan made arrangement to defend the fort of Mahrassa p 19 his treachery in conjunction with the *amirs* of Ahmad Shah his execution p 193

Ibrahim Qutb ul mulk became the ruler of Golkonda his character and habits period of reign pp 169 170

Ibrahim Shah Sultan son of Muhammad Shah Sultan of Kashmir was placed on the throne of his father by Malik Kaji p 690 accession his *talil* rise of Abdal Malik and his advance towards Kashmir p 696 message of Abdal Malik to Malik Kaji p 697 victorious fight of Abdal Malik period of reign p 698

Ibrahim Shah son of Muhammad Shah brother of Nazuk Shah Sultan of Kashmir accession p 725 hostility between Chizi Khan and Daulat Chak p 726 settlement between Chizi Khan and Daulat Chak destruction of Tibet p 727 earthquake in Kashmir p 728

Ibrahim Sharqi Sultan advanced from Jaunpur to capture Delhi but returned to his country on hearing of the advance of Muzaffar Shah p 186 was reinforced by the arrival of Shahzada Bahadur Khan p 321 had an interview with Bahadur

Shāh, p 330, succeeded Mubārak Shāh, condition of Jaunpūr, p 449, literary works which were written in his name, personal qualifications, advanced to destroy Sultān Mahmūd and Mallū Iqbāl Khān, p 450, laid siege to Kanauj, conquered Kanauj and made it over to Ikhtiyār Khān, captured Sanbal and entrusted, p 451, it to Tātār Khān, seized the town of Baran and made it over to Malik Marjān, returned towards Jaunpūr, fight and peace with Khidr Khān, advanced to conquer Kālpī, p 452, returned towards Jaunpūr hearing of the advance of Mubārak Shāh, died, period of reign, p 453

‘Īdī Zīnā, his anger on the murder of Ūjh Bahrām, p 710, fought with the Kīshwārā army as the commander of Mīrzā Haider’s troop, p 711, fight with the Mughals, p 715, his house at Srīnagar was burnt, p 716, his daughter was married to Habīb Chak, rise of his power, p 719, settlement with Ghāzī Khān, p 720, released the Mughals, p 721, fight with Ghāzī Khān, p 722, his victory over the Niyāzīs, p 723, was defeated by Daulat Chak, his death, p 724

Iftikhār-ul-mulk, Malik, was granted Muhammadpūr by Ahmad Shāh as his fief, p 205, was sent with an army by Ahmad Shāh, his victorious fight, p 208, was sent with Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p 213, seized a large elephant as booty on the destruction of Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn, p 214, was sent by Zafar Khān to surround Thāna, p 215

Ikhtiyār Khān, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to meet Rāy Batāī, p 272, joined Sultān Bahādur in the

town of Dhār, p 355, the charge of the government of Mandū was placed in his hands, p 356, was left to carry on the siege of the fort of Rāīsīn, p 363, was sent by Sultān Bahādur to capture the fort of Mandīsōr, p 368, was enlisted among the courtiers of Humāyūn, p 375, Kanauj was made over to him by Sultān Ibrāhīm, p 451, was entrusted with the government of Mandū by Sultān Bahadur, p 616

Ikhtiyār Khān Gujrātī, became powerful but was put to death, p 385

Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, was sent to reassure the citizens of Dhār, p 298, attacked Saiyid Mubārak, p 395, advised I‘tmād Khān to leave Ahmadābād, p 404, arrived at Ahmadābād, p 407, proposed to conquer Bahrōj, p 410, was enlisted in the band of the loyal servants, p 414

Ikhtiyār-ul-mulk, Malik, was made ‘Imād-ul-mulk by Mahmūd Shāh and was appointed as *nā‘ib ghāibat*, all the soldiers of Malik Hājī were made over to him by Mahmūd Shāh, p 248

Ilīyās, Hājī, Sultān of Bangāla, slew Sultān ‘Alā-ud-dīn, his possessions, gave himself the title of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn, had public prayers read in his name, marched to Jājnagar, p 421, his administration, p 422, fled to the fort of Ekdāla, fought with Sultān Fīrūz and fled, sent tribute to Fīrūz Shāh and prayed for pardon, sent Malik Tāj-ud-dīn to Delhī with tribute, p 423, died, period of reign, p 424 (and see note 4 of p 424)

‘Ilm-ud dīn, Saiyid, p 327, became a martyr, p 328

Imad Maulana brought a gift to Mahmud Khalji p 539 joined Nasir ud din p 558

Imad ud din Ghuri Malik joined the army of Muhammad Khan on the bank of the river Krishna was put to death by Muhammad Khan p 59

Imad ud din Khurasani Ma l na fought against Shahab Khan p 586

Imad ul mulk was appointed by Sultan Muhammad to subdue Hasan Hasan defeated and slew him p 9 10

Imad ul mulk son of Imad ul mulk with his help Malik Barid dethroned Ahmad Shah p 133 was sent by Sultan Ahmad Gujrati to fight with Sultan Hushang seized all those who had joined Hushang and brought them to Sultan Ahmad Gujrati p 191 was appointed by Muzaffar Shah to crush Rana Sanka taking Qawan ul mulk went to Parantej p 311 was deputed by Sultan Bahadur for revenue collection fought with Mirza Askari and was defeated p 376 enmity arose between him and Darya Khan went as a suppliant to Miran Mubarak Shah being defeated by the army of Gujrat fled from Burhanpur p 386 attacked I tmad Khan p 396 news of his encampment reached Mahmud Shah p 392 sent a message to Bihjat Khan p 593 entered the fort of the Rajputs and opened the gate to his soldiers p 603

Imad ul mulk Kawi Malik submitted himself to Sultan Bahadur of Gujrat and instigated him to invade the Deccan p 4 Sultan Muhammad Lashkari granted him Kawi as jagir p 94 took up the duties of va r of Mahmud Shah consulted Malka i-Jahan in administration

was attacked by Dilawar Khan p 119 went to Kawi p 113 invited Mahmud Shah to come to Kawi advanced to crush Malik Barid met the army of Malik Barid p 131 returned to Kawi p 132 reinforced Muhammad Khan of Asir and Burhanpur fought with the amirs of the Deccan fled to Asir and Burhanpur regained possession of his dominions with the help of Bahadur Shah Gujrati p 135 his hospitable transaction with Isma il Adil Khan p 161 sent a representation to Sultan Bahadur p 346

Imad ul mulk Samarqandi Malik was sent with an army to meet Sultan Hushang by Ahmad Shah arrested some of the disturbers p 195

Imad ul mulk Sultan helped to place Sikandar Khan on the throne p 33 determined to dethrone Sultan Sikandar p 396 his entrance into the palace of Sultan Sikandar p 327 placed Nasir Khan on the throne of Sultan Sikandar p 328 despatched letters to various powers for help p 329 collected troops to meet Bahadur Shah p 331 paid wages for one year to the soldiers p 339 sent men towards Baroda p 334 took shelter in the house of Shah Jiu Shadiqi was seized and ordered to be hanged p 335 was sent by Sultan Bahadur to attack Bhupat p 357 was sent by Sultan Bahadur to chastise Bhupat and Rana p 362 fought with Puran Mal and made him run away and imprisoned some of the *Purab as* submitted a report to Sultan Bahadur p 363 was sent by Sultan Bahadur to capture the fort of Mandisor p 368

Iqbāl Khān, was sent to fight against Mubārak Khān by Mahmūd Khālji, p 527, was appointed to get rid of Shēr Khān, p 567, pursued Khawājah Suhail and Mahābat Khān, p 568, went to defend Asū and Buihūnpūr, p 570, sent a message to Mahmūd Shāh, p 577, was summoned by Mahmūd Shāh, his flight from his house, p 579, sent the corpse of Shihāb-ud-dīn to Shādīābād p 580, his petition to Mahmūd Shāh, p 581, joined Mahmūd Shāh, p 582, was slain by the order of Mahmūd Shāh, p 587

'Isā Khān Sūr, was left in the town of Ujjain by Islām Khān p 627

'Isā Sālār, Malik, rose in revolt, p 194

'Isā Tarkhān, Mīrzā, ruler of Sīnd, defeated the Jām's army, p 778, account of his rule in Sīnd, p 784

Isfandiyār, p 4

Ishāq, Malik, son of Qutb-ul-mulk, sent a petition to Mahmūd Khālji, who conferred the title of Daulat Khān, wealth and honour on him, p 504

Ishāq, Qādī Pīr, was sent to reinforce Malik Shaikhā, fought with Alf Khān, p 280 (and see also note 1 on p 280)

'Ishqī Mullā, went as an ambassador to 'Alī Shāh, p 750

Iskandar, Jām, son of Jām Fath Khān, ruler of Sīnd, account of his rule, p 777

Iskandar Kakhar, reinforced Muhammad Shāh, p 692

Iskandar Khān, was made successor to the throne by Muhammad Shāh, p 691, skirmishes with Muhammad Shāh, p 694

Islām Khān, the possessions of Shēr Khān devolved on him, p 623, placed the reins of Mālwa in the hands of Shujā' Khān, his anger with

Shujā' Khān, p 624, a message from Shujā' Khān, p 625, went to enquire about Shujā' Khān, p 626, rewarded Shujā' Khān, detached soldiers to pursue Shujā' Khān, took possession of Mālwa, p 627, pardoned the offences of Shujā' Khān and bestowed Sārangpūr and Rāisīn on the latter, his death, p 628

Islām Khān of Kashmīr, made an amicable settlement with Haibat Khān Niyāzī, p 713, an ambassador came from Mīrzā Haidar, p 714, was slain by Muhammad Khān Chak, p 751

Ismā'il, p 162, was blinded by his brother 'Alī 'Adil Khān, p 163

Ismā'il, son of Mīr Bihushtī, relations with Fattū, his rank in service, imprisoned Ṣalābat Khān, showed a written letter to Ṣalābat Khān, p 149, his rise to power, his cruelty, p 150

Ismā'il, Shāh, the Badshāh of Irān, sent Yādgār Bēg Qazlbāsh to Mahmūd Shāh with presents, p 290.

Ismā'il 'Adil Khān, succeeded his father, his character, his achievements, received a title, p 160, description of his soldiers, sent ships to Hurmuz and summoned men from 'Irāq and Khurāsān, transaction with 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwīlī, his wars with Nizām-ul-mulk and their results, period of reign, p 161

Ismā'il Afghān, p 9

Ismā'il Fath, was placed on the throne by Hasan Gāngū with the title of Nāsir-ud-dīn, p 8 (and see note 3 on pp 8-9), crept into the fort of Dhārāgarh, p 9

Ismā'il Hāyat, went to bring Sankar Chak, p 720

Ismā'il Khān Kālpī, p 507

Isma'il Nizam ul mulk Jamal Khan as an all in all in his government his attitude towards the white skinned people Jamal Khan invaded the Adil Shahi country and became victorious p 155 arrival of Burhan in the Deccan p 156 Burhan took the possession of Berar opposition of Jamal Khan Burhan possessed Ahmadnagar period of reign p 157

Isma'il Safvi Shah sent an ambassador to Gujrat p 586

Isma'il Shah brother of Ibrahim Shah Sultan of Kashmir accession p 7-9

Imdad Khan refused to believe the message of Burhan summoning him p 390 was appointed by Sultan Mahmud as the attendant of his harem p 393 placed Radi ul mulk on the throne of Sultan Mahmud kept the affairs of Kingdom in his own hands and kept Radi ul mulk confined in his house fought and defeated Sultan Ahmad p 395 confined Sultan Ahmad in his house put Sultan Ahmad to death p 396 declared on oath that Nanu was the real heir of the throne of Sultan Ahmad p 397 remained as *ta'ir* in the reign of Sultan Muzaffar p 398 kept Sultan Muzaffar Nanu in a state of imprisonment attacked the Fuladis p 399 refused the demands of the Fuladis was defeated by the Fuladis met Musa Khan and Sher Khan but was defeated gave up the possession of the *jagir* of Haj Khan and took up his quarters at Ahmadabad received a message from Chengiz Khan p 400 sent a reply to the message of Chengiz Khan p 401 sent a reply to Chengiz Khan inducing him to conquer Naderbar p 402 commenced to

equip his army after receiving the message of Chengiz Khan left the city and encamped in the vicinity of Batuh on the arrival of Chengiz Khan took Muzaffar Shah to the battlefield but being frightened fled towards Dungarpur p 404 arrived at Ahmadabad bringing Muzaffar Shah with him wrote a letter to Sher Khan for the evacuation of Bahdar p 410 did not accept the agreement which was settled among the *amirs* p 411 deceived Juhjar Khan sent a letter to Sher Khan stating that Nanu was not the son of the Sultan p 412 summoned the Mirzas from Bahroj sent a petition to Khahfa ilah requesting him to conquer Gujrat p 413

J

Jada was appointed by Shaikh Shuja ul mulk plundered the house of a poor man p 807

Ja far Khan was sent by his father to Sultan Bahadur of Gujrat with a request took permission to visit the city of Ahmadabad p 346

Jaga moved about in the hills went for protection to Ratan Sen p 348 was sent for by Sultan Bahadur p 349

Jahan Khan his letter to Ahmad Shah informing him of the intention of Sultan Hushang p 197

Jahangir Badrah as the *ta'ir* of Fath Shah joined Muhammad Shah p 699

Jahangir Malr fled from Kashmir p 681 came to strengthen the Kashmiris p 684 persuaded Muhammad Shah to come out of Kashmir p 686 fought with the army of Fath Khan and defeated it advanced for the second time to meet Fath Khan p 687 his message

- to the Rāja of Rājaurī, summoned the Sayyids, fight with Fath Khān, p 688, his seclusion, p 689, as the commander of the army of Fath Shāh, was killed, p 692
- Jahāngī Mākri, agent of Mīrzā Haidar, was awarded the fief of Husam Mākri, p 115
- Jahāngīr Qulī Bēg, ruled Bangāla on behalf of Humāyūn *Bādshāh*, was slain by Shēr Khān, p 445
- Jāildah, Shaikh, p 301, fled from Mandū and complained about the power and violence of Pūrabīa Rājpūts to Muzaffar Shāh, p 302, received a letter to Sultān Mahmud Sharqī, p 456, sent a letter to Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, p 457, by his exertions peace was effected between Mahmūd Khaljī and Mahmūd Sharqī, p 519
- Jai Singh, account of his rebellion against Mahmūd Shāh, p 257
- Jai Singh Rāy, proprietor of the fort of Birākar, p 99
- Jākar Zand, Mīr, arrival in Multān, p 803, was respected by Jām Bāyazīd, p 804
- Jalāl Bukhārī, Sayyid, p 327
- Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, shut himself in the fort of Mālkonda, p 78, was released from the prison of Humāyūn Shāh, was put to death by a *kotwāl*, p 82, incited Mahmūd Khaljī to seize the fort of Māhūr, p 526
- Jalāl Kōkhar Malik, was displaced by Ā'zam Humāyūn, p 184
- Jalāl-ud-dīn, Sayyid, asked for the help of Mahmūd Khaljī against the oppression of Ghāzī Khān, p 533
- Jalāl-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, became a Musalmān, assumed the name of Sultān Jalāl-ud-dīn, died, period of reign, p 432 (and see note 3, p 432)
- Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī, Shaikh, was respected by Jām Bāyazīd, p 796, a wonderful story which was narrated by him, p 804
- Jamāl, Shaikh, father of Shaikh 'Abd-ul-haī, p 621
- Jamāl Khān Gujrātī, his fight, his rank in service, p 153, sentenced Mīrzā Khān to death, p 154, placed Ismā'il Nizām-ul-mulk on the throne, kept Ismā'il as a puppet and himself rose in power, invaded the 'Ādil Shāhī country, p 155, attacked Burhān-ul-mulk and was killed, p 157, defeated 'Ādil Khān, fought with Rāja 'Alī Khān, his death, p 158
- Jamāl-ud-dīn, Malik, was given the title of Muhāfiz Khān by Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī, p 255, was appointed as *Shahna* and *kotwāl* and posted to Ahmadābād, satisfactory discharge of his duties improved his honour, wealth and rank, p 256, was promoted to the rank of *vazīr*, p 257, was ordered to execute Bhīm Rāy, p 262, was directed by 'Imād-ul-mulk to attend on Prince Ahmad Khān and to guard the city on the day of 'Id, p 265, was transferred to the post of 'Imād-ul-mulk, p 271, his charge when the fort of Chāmpānīr was besieged by Sultān Mahmūd, p 273, reported to Sultān Mahmūd about the cure of Rāy Batāī, charge of the erection of *Jahān Panāh* citadel was given to him, p 276, was sent to receive and welcome Sāhib Khān by Muzaffar Shāh, p 293, fled and sought the protection of Rāy Singh p 336, joined Latīf Khān, p 337
- Jamāl-ud-dīn Astrābādī, Khwājah, went with presents to Mahmūd Khaljī, pp 540-41

Jam Firuz left Thatha and joined Sulṭān Bahadur p 345

Jamī p 581

Jamīl Hafiz Mulla received favours from Sulṭān Zain ul abidin p 607

Jamshid Sultan son of Sulṭān Shams uddin Sulṭān of Kashmir accession p 637 struggle with Ali Sher p 638 period of reign p 639

Jamshid Khan p 153 his decision his proclamation was put to death p 154

Jamhid Qutb ul mulk succeeded his father period of reign p 108

Jan Baba was defeated by his brother p 785

Jani Beg Mirza ruler of Sind account of his reign p 786

Jariah mother of Nanu p 397

Jarju a pigeon fancier p 386

Jarud helped Saiyid Ibrahim and Saiyid Ya qub in their release p 79

Jasrat Khokhar p 601 became powerful in the Punjab and brought it into his possession p 602

Jawash Khan was sent to crush Shihab ud din p 575 despatched a report to Mahmud Shah and was summoned back p 576 was given a title and sent to crush Mukhtas Khan and Iqbal Khan p 580 was summoned by Mahmud Shah p 58

Jay Sinha Rayzada his flight p 765 his fight with Muhammad Qasim p 769

Jesus p 547

Jhaju Muhammad his title p 238 for further account see Kabir Sultani Malik

Jhuhjār Khan attacked Saiyid Mu barak p 395 advised Iṭmad Khan to leave Ahmadabad p 404 took Sultan Muzaffar to Dungarpur and made him over to Iṭmad Khan

p 406 explained his position

p 407 started for the *chaugan* field with Chengiz Khan p 408 killed Chengiz Khan p 409 went to Iṭmad Khan p 41

Jhujar Khan defeated Malik Mahmud p 593

Jiu Shah Shaikh the descendant of Qutb Alam Shaikh Burhan ud din p 34 was slain in the house of Qadr Khan p 336

Jivan Das Khattry was appointed to the post of *ra'is* by Sulṭān Ahmad Shah p 18

Juna Malik came out of the camp with Ahmad Shah was sent by Ahmad Shah to make an enquiry informed Ahmad Shah about Sulṭān Hushang and his army p 20

Junan Jam ruler of Sind account of his government p 773

K

Kabir Sulṭānī Malik his title prepared to create disturbances resolved to remove Malik Sha ban Imad ul mulk from his office p 938 went to his house p 239 his amazement p 240 fled from the *darbar* went among the *grassias* was slain by them p 241

Kaji Chak Malik as the *ra'is* of Muhammad Shah his power of judgment imprisoned Ibrahim Malri p 693 fought against Iskandar Khan went to Rujauri p 694 as the *ra'is* of Muhammad Shah imprisoned Muhammad Shah and raised Ibrahim Khan to the throne p 69 as the *ra'is* of Ibrahim Shah p 696 went to the village of Sillah to meet Abdal Makri a messenger from Abdal Makri p 697 his defeat and flight p 698 his defeat by Abdal Makri p 700 owing to the treachery of Abdal

- Mākri went to Hindūstān, p. 701, his defeat and flight, p. 702, fought with the Kāshgharīs, p. 703, his residence, p. 705, disputes with Abdāl Mākri, p. 706, defeat by Mīrzā Haidar, brought reinforcements from Shīr Khān Afghān, p. 708, fight with Mīrzā Haidar, advanced to crush Mīrzā Haidar, p. 709, his flight, death, p. 710
- Kalīm-ul-lah, (son of Mahmūd Shāh), was placed in place of Walī-ul-lah Sultān by Malik Barīd, his imprisonment in Bīdar p. 134, 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwili went to the aid of Muhammad Khān, fought with Nizām-ul-mulk Malik Barīd, Khudāwand Khān and the *amīrs* of the Deccan, fled to Asīr and Burhānpūr, with the help of Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt 'Imād-ul-mulk regained his possessions and read the *Khutba* in the name of Sultān Bahādur in the *parganas* of his territories, and invited him to invade the Deccan, Nizām-ul-mulk, Malik Barīd, and other *amīrs* could not withstand the Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt and read the *Khutba* in his name in Ahmadnagar and all the provinces of the Deccan were divided among the four *amīrs*, p. 135
- Kālū, Malik, one of the adherents of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 239, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to seize the murderer of Ādam Sīlāhdār, was executed by the order of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 248, was defeated by Muzaffar Ibrāhīm, p. 518
- Kānhā, Rāja, Rāja of Jhālāwār, p. 212, hearing of the marches of Ahmad Shāh left his country, brought a force from Sultān Ahmad Bahmanī, plundered parts of Nadarhār, p. 213, joined Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, p. 214
- Kamāl, Mīr, was slain in the battle-field, p. 703
- Kamāl Khān with Šafdar Khān went to punish Bahādur Gīlānī, they fought and were wounded, fell into Bahādur's hands, and were sent to Dābul, p. 117 (and see note 1, p. 160)
- Kamāl Kōkah, a tradition about his name, p. 718
- Kamāl-ud-dīn, Maulānā, p. 745
- Kamāl-ud-dīn, Sayīd, was slain by Ghāzī Khān, p. 533
- Kamāl-ud-dīn Mālwi, Shaikh, pp. 299, 588
- Kāmīl Khān, Ibrāhīm 'Ādil Khān was placed on the throne by his help, p. 165, was slain by Kīshwar Khān, p. 166
- Kāmran, Mīrzā, sent an army to conquer Kashmīr, p. 700
- Kaniyā, Rānī, wife of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 600
- Kank Dās, Rāy, fought with Sultān Muhammad, asked Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī for aid, p. 225
- Kāns, Rāja, how he acquired power, his son became a Musalmān and sat on the throne, p. 430, period of his power, p. 431 (and see note 3, p. 430)
- Kapūr Chand, brought a message from Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī to Mahmūd Khaljī, p. 542
- Karn, Jām, ruler of Sīnd, account of his government, p. 776
- Karshāshab, father of Tāhīr Āl, p. 633
- Khadam Khān, p. 124
- Khalif Hasan 'Arab, Malik-ut-tujār, was appointed to conquer Mahām by Ahmad Shāh, p. 49, possessed Mahām, fought with Zafar Khān but was defeated, p. 50, opposed Nasīr Khān as far as Asīr and raided part of that territory, p. 58, advanced to capture the fort

of Sangesar seized the fort of Raja Sarka and made him prisoner p 61 forgave Sarka made Sarka the leader of his army Sarka led him to a place where the whole army was murdered p 62 p 65 n

Khalifa 1 Ilahu His Majesty sent Pishrau Khan to give an account of the administration of Murtaḍa Nizām Shah p 147 Murtaḍa Nizām Shah in his service showed favours to Burhan gave shelter to the amīrs of Berar p 148 issued *farmans* to the amīrs and *Zamindars* in favour of Burhan Nizām ul mulk p 158 was requested by I timad Khan to invade Gujrat sent Khan Kalan to conquer Sirohi marched towards Gujrat p 413

Khalil Khan Shahzada was given the country of Sorath forts of Junagarh and Karnal by Mahmud Shah p 277

Khanam widow of Mirza Haidar her advice to the Muḥals p 718

Khanam sister of Mirza Haidar went to Kashghar p 723

Khan Jahan marched towards Malhonda was attacked and defeated by Sikandar Khan p 77 watched the city p 115 was sent by Sulṭan Ahmad Bahmani to fight with Shahzada Muhammad p 113 went to reinforce Malik ut tujjar p 216 ruled Bangala after Khan Khanan and slew Daud p 446

Khan Jahan Shurazi took possession of Nausari p 377

Khan Jahan Sulṭani through his intervention Har Ray asked Ahmad Shah to be pardoned p 111

Khan Khanan his decision his proclamation p 154 defeated Daud and conquered Bangala p 446

Khan Khanan Ahmad Khan see Ahmad Shah Bahmani Sultan

Khan Zaman defeated Sankar Chal p 74 attacked Husain Khan p 743 his execution p 44

Khawāṣ Khan did not admit Shuhab ud din 574

Khudr Maulana his title p 38 was imprisoned and sent to Dip p 24 and see Kabir Sulṭani Malik

Khudr Malik took tribute from the Rajas of Balār Idar and Sirohi p 157 consultation by Malik Muḥlith was celebrated as Miyan Agha joined Sultan Hushang p 471

Khudr Khan slew Mallu Khan p 451 ruled in Dolhi fight and peace with Sulṭan Ibrahim p 45

Khudawand Khan Mahur was conferred on him by Sulṭan Lashkari p 94 fought with Imad ul mulk Kawili p 135 his designation in the time of Murtaḍa Nizām Shah an event p 147 his performance p 148 was sent to Shaikh Muhammad Qasim Budhu by Muzaffar Shah p 187 was appointed as the vaṣī of the kingdom by Mahmud Shah and was left in attendance on Shahzada Ahmad Khan at Ahmada bad private talk with Ray Rayan to unite with Imad ul mulk and to place Shāhzada Ahmad Khan on the throne p 264 sent for Ray Rayan and explained his views about Imad ul mulk kept his intention in secret p 166 was fined by Mahmud Shah p 270 was ordered to be arrested p 271 was left by Muzaffar Shah to guard the camp p 300 gave advice to Muzaffar Shah p 319 was ordered to summon Bahadur Khan p 30 helped to place Sikandar Khan on the throne p 33 sought to be ahead of the others p 309 rendered homage to Sulṭan Bahadur p 335

was sent to Bākar by Sultān Bahādur, p 347, waited upon Sultān Bahādur, p 348, was left to accompany the camp, p 357, was murdered by Burhān, p 390

Khurāsān Khān, deserted Sultān Bahādur and joined the army of Humāyūn Bādshāh, p 372

Khurram Khān, welcomed Bahādur Shāh, p 331

Khurshīd, Rānī, p 545, took the side of Shujā'at Khān in the latter's fraternal dispute, p 552, made over the treasures of Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn to Nāsir Shāhī agents, p 553, her report against Sultān Nāsir-ud-dīn, p 554, took the affairs of the kingdom in her hands, narrated the death of Mūnjā Baqāl to Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p 555, representation to Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p 556, her order to the pay-master, sent an army in pursuit of Shaikh Hābib and Khwājah Suhail, p 557, sent a report about the power of Nāsir-ud-dīn to Sultān Ghīyāth-ud-dīn, p 559, her advice to Shujā'at Khān, p 561, dismissed 'Alī Khān and appointed Malik Piyārā, p 562, she was seized by the *amīrs* of Nāsir Shāh, p 563, was made over to custodians p 564

Khush-Qadam, Malik, was given the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk by Sultān Muzaffar Shāh, p 293

Khwājah Bābū, was imprisoned but was released by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p 340

Khwājah Jahān, went to protect Asīr and Burhānpūr, p 570

Khwājah Jahān Malik Shāh Turk, seizing the bridle of the horse of Nizām Shāh went to Bidar, pp 244, 535

Kishan Rāy, p 20, surrendered his fort to Mujāhid Shāh, p 21

Kishwar Khān, p 165, slew Kāmīl Khān, became the *vakīl* of Ibrāhīm 'Adīl Khān, was put to death, p 166

Kōbī Zunnārdār, Malik, was sent by Rāja of Idar to Muzaffar Shāh, p 297

Kōnbhā, his defeat by Muḥmūd Khālji, p 514, attacked Mahmūd Khālji but was defeated by the latter, p 515, agreed to pay tribute to Mahmūd Khālji, p 520, sent tribute to Mahmūd Khālji, p 527, sent a message to Mahmūd Khālji for the pardon of his offences, p 528, sent troops to confront the army of Mahmūd Khālji, p 529

Kōpā Dēvī, wife of Rāja Adwan, her message to Shāh Mīr, attacked Shāh Mīr, conversion to Islām, her imprisonment, p 635

Kōpwārī, sister of Yūsuf Chak, was married to Ghāzī Khān, p 721

L

Lādan Khālji, Malik, his hostile attitude towards Malik Hisām-ud-dīn Maghūl, had an interview with Āsaf Khān and welcomed him, was given the title of Khān Jahān by Mahmūd Shāh, p 284, the village of Banās was given to him by Mahmūd Shāh, p 285

Lājūn, Malik, was sent by Sultān Tughlaq to summon the *amīrs* of hundreds of Daulatābād, was slain by the *amīrs* of hundreds, p 2

Lakhman Sēn, strengthened the citadel of Rāisīn and was ready for battle, p 359, his advice to Silhadī, p 361, sent two thousand *Pūrabās* to fight with the army of Gujrāt, p 362, agreed to evacuate the fort of Rāisīn if Sultān Bahādur would excuse the offences of Silhadī and summon him from the fort of Mandū, a request to Sultān Bahādur, p 365

Lalitadat Devharah Raja the temple which was built by him p 648

Lang Shahzada joined Mirza Haidar p 716 his release p 7

Langar Khan p 800 joined Mirza Shah Husain p 806 gained possession of Multan was summoned by Mirza Kamran and was granted the territory of Bhal by the latter p 810

Latif entered the service of Bahadur Shah p 331

Latif Ustad accompanied Yusuf Khan p 61

Latif Khan was sent by Ahmad Shah to punish Malik Shah Malik defeated Malik Shah Malik p 190

Latif Khan Baridil Malik Sultan Sikandar conferred on him the title of Sharzahi Khan advanced to put down Shalida Latif Khan but was slain p 300

Latif Khan Shahzada his intention to seize the throne of Sikandar Khan p 300 went as a suppliant to Fath Khan p 331 remained concealed at Champaur p 336 his arrival at Awas p 338 fought and died p 341

Latif Zakariya placed Shahzada Masud Khan on the throne of Malwa p 494

Loar was sent to conquer Loharkut by Sultan Qutbuddin and was slain p 642

Lodha governor of Kanduyah p 586 attacked Shahab Khan p 587 was nominated to punish Sikandar Khan p 591 was murdered p 59

Lohar Chak was sent with an army to Rajauri was seized by Muhammad Khan Chak p 750 imprisoned Ali Khan intention of the Kashmiris about him p 755 Kashmir came under his power p 756 his defeat

and imprisonment was blinded p 57

Lohar Makri his share in Kashmir p 699

Luli Laund Malik made proposals of peace p 74 his imprisonment p 740 fled to Ali Khan p 748

M

Madarai Ray was sent by Sultan Sikandar to Tibet his rebellion death p 640

Mahlo Singh received Yusuf Khan p 761

Maghi Malik father of Mahmud Khan p 1

Mahabat Khan the governor of Chandri was killed on the battlefield pp 88 830

Mahabat Khan joined Sher Khan p 56 instigated Sher Khan to battle p 566 taking the wounded Sher Khan with him fled from the battlefield 608

Mahli p 618

Mahdi Kohah accompanied Yusuf Khan p 761

Mahmud Malik was defeated by Jhujir Khan p 593

Mahmud Malil son of Malil Mughith see Mahmud Khalji Sultan Sultan of Malwa

Mahmud Sultan the ruler of Bhakkar ruler of Sind account of his reign p 786

Mahmud Sultan son of Ibrahim Sharqi succeeded his father sent an ambassador with presents to Sultan Mahmud Khalji p 43 asked permission to punish Nasir Khan Jahan for his cruelty and disobedience reply of Sultan Mahmud Khalji p 404 advanced towards Kalpi p 455 started for Kalpi to meet Sultan Mahmud Khalji sent troops to raid the country of Barhar

joined the detachment which was sent to Barhār, sent a letter to the Shaikh-ul-Islām, Shaikh Jāīaldah, p 456, his emissary was sent to Sultān Mahmūd Khālji by Shaikh Jāīaldah with a note of advice, acceptance of the proposals, p. 457, returned to Jaunpūr, treatment of his people, conquest of Chunār advanced into the country of Orissa, period of reign, p 458

Mahmūd, Sultān, son of Sultān Firūz, Sultān of Multān, his accession, p 800, his associates, his disposition towards Jām Bāyazīd, p 801, was wounded by 'Ālam Khān, nominated *amīrs* to punish Jām Bāyazīd, p 802, peace with Jām Bāyazīd, p 803, a wonderful story which was narrated by Shaikh Jalāl-ud-dīn Quraishī, p 804, *farmān* of Bābar Bādshāh to Mīrzā Shāh Husain Arghūn, collected his troops and sent an ambassador to the latter, his death, p 805

Mahmūd Barkī, Malik, was sent by Ahmad Shāh to punish Nasīr, captured Nādōt, p 199

Mahmūd Garjistānī Khawājah, sold 'Ādil Khān to Mahmūd Shāh Bahmanī, p 159

Mahmūd Gilānī, Khawājah, Malik-ut-tujjār, defeated the Mandū army, p 535

Mahmud Khālji, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa, on the invitation of Sikandar Khān Bukhārī came to conquer Berār, p 70, besieged Māhur, after the arrival of 'Alā-ud-dīn Shāh, Khālji returned towards Mandū, p 71, at the instigation of Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī invaded, p 87, the Deccan, fought but was defeated by Malik-ut-tujjār, p 88, appeared before Nizām Shah's army and after defeat, pursued, p 89, it as far as Bīdar, on

the arrival of Mahmūd Gujrātī started for Mandū, p 90, advanced to conquer, p 91, the Deccan, arrived on the frontier of Daulatābād, heard that Mahmūd Gujrātī was approaching, marched towards Māl-konda, p 92, wanted to help Rāy Kank Dās, p 225, but did not advance to support him, p 226, started to conquer Gujrāt, ordered destruction of Barnāma, invaded Gujrāt, p 227, met Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn in Kaparbanj, wrote a couplet to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 228, was defeated by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn and went back to Mālwa, p 229, attacked Nizām Shāh, p 243, travelled by way of Gōndwāna towards Mālwa, p 244, invaded the Deccan, plundered the neighbourhood of Daulatābād, retired to his own country, a letter from Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī, reply to Mahmūd Gujrātī, p 251, came from Mandū to Dhār and prayed for help from Muzaffar Shāh, p 305, marched with Āsaf Khān against Bhīm Karan Pūrbīa, fought, was wounded and taken prisoner, p 307, sent Sharzah Khān to plunder the towns in the territory of Chitōr, sent Daryā Khān with a message to Sultān Bahādur, p 350, conferred the title of Sultān Ghiyās-ud-dīn on his son and neglected to see Sultān Bahādur, p 352, came out to give battle, p 353, was treated with respect by Sultān Bahādur but owing to his harsh attitude was arrested, p 354, wrote a letter in reply to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p 454, despatched a note in favour of Nasīr Khān to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p 455, advanced towards Chandēri and Kālpī, struggle between the army of Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p 456,

proposing some conditions made peace with Sulṭān Mahmud Sharqī p 457 was granted favours and title by Sulṭān Hushang p 474 Chaznīn Khan was placed in his charge by Sulṭān Hushang his guarantee for faithfulness to Chaznīn Khan his interview with other *sardars* p 48, his reply to Malik Uthman Jalīd p 486 informed Chaznīn Khan about the intention of Zafar Minjumla p 48 attend d on Sulṭān Hushang during his last illness sent a reply to Chaznīn Khan p 488 became watchful for the death of Hushang his orders p 489 declared Chaznīn Khan as the heir of Sulṭān Hushang after rendering homage confirmed the accession of Chaznīn Khan p 490 result of his skill in administration p 491 his reply to the suspicions of Sulṭān Muhammad p 493 caused the murder of Sulṭān Muhammad sent a reply to Malik Bayazīd Shaikhā p 494 kept his men ready fought with the *amirs* and defeated them p 496 sent a message to Khan Jahan p 496 accession on the throne of Malwa description of his reforms and benevolence p 497 contributions to education attempt of Hushang Shahī *amirs* to injure him wounded some of the conspirators p 498 punished the conspirators excused Shahzada Ahmad Khan as well as the others who took part in the conspiracy on the request of Āzam Humayun sent Āzam Humayun Khan Jahan to suppress the rebels of Islamabad p 499 sent out detachments to fight with Sulṭān Ahmad p 501 his generosity towards the poor summoned some *amirs* who were hostile to Sulṭān Ahmad p 502

made a night attack on the camp of Sulṭān Ahmad held a consultation and its decision p 503 sent Tāj Khan and Manjur Khan in advance of himself to Srirangpur a petition of Malik Ishaq reached him arrived at Srirangpur and conferred favours on Malik Ishaq and on others p 504 defeated and sentenced Shahzada Umr Khan to death p 506 a message from the leaders and commanders of the army of Chandrī sent an army to crush Malik Sulaiman arrived at Chandrī and fought with Malik Sulaiman p 506 captured the citadel of Chandrī allotted Chandrī as a *jagir* to Malik Muzaḥfir Ibrahim p 507 relieved the city of Narwar from the siege of Dungar Sen and returned to Shāhabād erected the tomb of Hushang Shah and the *Jama Masjid* of Hushang Shah near the Ram Sarai gate p 508 petitions from the *amirs* of Malwa and the great men of Delhi advanced towards Delhi encamped in the village of Panna Sulṭān Ahmad took up a position with Tughlaqabad at his rear p 509 sent troops against the army of Sulṭān Muhammad his dream agreed to a pacific settlement with Muhammad Khan and returned to Malwa p 510 his stay and benefactions in Shāhabād advanced towards Kalpi for the destruction of Naṣir Shah p 511 accepted the petition of Naṣir Shah and turned towards Chitor devastated the temples encamped at Konbhalnūr p 512 seized the fortifications of the Rajputs destruction of the temple and the idols of the Rajputs p 513 seized a fort at the foot of the Chitor hill besieged Chitor defeated Konbha sent

detachments for ravaging Chitōi, summoned Ā'zam Humāyūn Khān Jahān to capture the possessions of the Rājputs, his grief on the death of Ā'zam Humāyūn, appointed Tāj Khān in the place of Ā'zam Humāyūn, p 514, opposed the attack of Kōnbhā and defeated him, returned to Shādiābād, a message from Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī regarding the religious disobedience of Nasir, p 515, gave permission to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī to chastise Nasir, request of Nasir, sent 'Ali Khān to Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī and, p 516, the latter's reply, advanced to protect Nasir, p 517, after fighting with the army of Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī returned to Fathābād, sent Muzaffar Ibrāhīm to suppress Mubārak Khān, p 518, peace with Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, establishment of a hospital, advanced to capture the fort of Mandalgarh, p 519, agreed to a peace with the Rājputs and returned to his own dominions, conferred favours on Saiyid Muhammad Khān, captured the town of Alhanpūr, p 520, took tribute from the Rāja of Kōtah and returned to Shādiābād, request of Gangdās, advanced to help Gangdās, p 521, besieged the town of Sultānpūr, granted rank and title to Malik 'Alā-ud-dīn, his grief on the death of Sultān Muhammad, p 522, ravaged the town of Barōda, fight with Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn and its result, p 523, appointed Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to raid the town of Sūrat, made peace with Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 525, punished the Rājputs of Mahōli, changed hostility between Yūsuf Khān Hindanī and the governor of Biyāna into friendship, left the government

of the fort of Rantambhōr and Hārautī in the charge of Qadam Khān, besieged Māhūr but fled, p 526, turned Mubārak Khān out of Balāna, sent Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to put down Mubārak Khān, advanced towards Chitōr, p 527, appointed Manšūr-ul-mulk to destroy Mandisōr, took tribute from Kōnbhā and turned towards Shādiābād, his advance towards Mandisōr, his sudden advance towards Ajmīr, p 528, gave up the idea of conquering the fort of Mandalgarh and returned to Shādiābād, p 529, captured the fort of Mandalgarh, p 530, sent Shāhzāda Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn to raid Kilwārah and Dilwārah, nominated Shāhzāda Qadam Khān and Tāj Khān to capture the fort of Būndī, appointed Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn and Qadam Khān to raid the countries of Kilwārah and Dilwārah, encamped in the vicinity of Kōnbhalmir, p 532, took tribute from the Rāja of Dūngarpūr, returned to Shādiābād, marched towards Asir, p 533, forgave 'Adil Khān's offences, march against Nizām Shāh, p 534, after defeat by Nizām Shāh retreated to his own territory, p 535, sent Maqbūl Khān with an army to suppress the disturbances in the fort of Kehrla, advanced towards Daulatābād, p 536, having raided some villages of Mālkōnda returned to Shādiābād, sent Maqbūl Khān to plunder Elhehpūr, p 537, treaty with the ruler of the Deccan, p 538, received Shaikh Nūr-ud-dīn with respect, welcomed the arrival of Maulānā 'Imād-ud-dīn, p 539, sent Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān to put down Maqbūl Khān, started towards Mahmūdābād, appointed Malik Dāūd to chastise the tribe

which had given shelter to the Rayzada p 540 accepted the presents of Mirza Abu Sa'id and sent various gifts in return planned the erection of the fortress of Jalalpur and placed Mirza Khan in charge of it p 541 agreement with Sultan Bahlul Lodi his death and period of reign pp 541-542

Mahmud Khan p 198 was nominated to proceed to the country of Sorath by Sultan Ahmad Gujrati recovered tribute from the *amindars* of Sorath p 199

Mahmud Khan commander of Abdul Makri p 696 his representation to Mirza Kamran p 700

Mahmud Khan Shuhzada country of Mahur was conferred on him by Ahmad Shah Bahmani p 48

Mahmud Khidr Malik went in pursuit of the conspirators p 498

Mahmud Kotwal Malik p 504 was killed by Sultan Chuyath ud din p 5

Mahmud Nauman Shaikh took a man to Sultan Chuyath ud din pp 548-49

Mahmud Nami Malik Umdat ul mulk was sent by Chaznin Khan to wait on Mahmud Khan p 484 was sent a second time to wait on Mahmud Khan p 485 told the news of Mahmud Khan to Chaznin Khan p 487 was sent to Mahmud Khan with the message of Chaznin Khan p 488 took the message of Mahmud Khan to Chaznin Khan p 489

Mahmud Shah Sultan of Bangala succeeded his father p 440 (and see note 1 p 440) his martyrdom period of reign p 441

Mahmud Shah Sultan son of Mahmud Shah Shaqi succeeded his father proved unfit for the throne dethronement time of reign p 459

Mahmud Shah Sultan Gujrati son of Muhammad Shah sent a letter to Mahmud Shah Bahmani giving an account of the treachery of Bihadur Gilani p 118 his flight from Amir Taimur p 181 date of accession to the throne of Gujrat p 137 attitude towards his people plot to cause disturbance p 138 ordered that the creators of disturbance be arrested end of the conspirators suppression of disturbances pp 139-44 marched in the direction of Kaparbanj regulated the administration of the *thanas* and of the *parganas* started from Ahmadabad encamped on the bank of the river Khari letter from Nizam Shah for assistance advanced to help Nizam Shah against Sultan Mahmud Khalji pp 90-92 and 243 directed attention towards the Deccan advanced into the country of Asir and Burhanpur encamped in the neighbourhood of Talpur army of Sultan Mahmud Khalji suffered hardships p 144 returned to Ahmadabad Jagirs of the soldiers of Gujrat the march towards the Deccan made Mahmud Khalji fly after ravaging the neighbourhood of Daulatabad turned back to Ahmadabad accepting the presents of Nizam Shah warning to Sultan Mahmud Khalji p 145 report about the infliction of the Zamindars of Bawar and of the fort of Dun punished and defeated the rebellious chiefs p 146 returned with success to Ahmadabad Bahadur ul mulk killed Adam Silahdar p 148 execution of Imad ul mulk and Add ul mulk Malik Ikhtiyar ul mulk was made Imad ul mulk marched to conquer the fort of Karnal p 148 on the way to

Jūnāgarh ravaged the country of Sōrath, arrived near the hill of Karnāl, p 249, defeated the Rāj-pūts, ravaged the surrounding country, besieged the fort of Karnāl, Rāy Mandalik asked for pardon, went back to Ahmadābād appointed soldiers to punish Rāy Mandalik, p 250, Rāy Mandalik was defeated by the soldiers of the Sultān and paid a tribute, p 251, rejected the counsel of the *amīrs* in connection of the conquest of Mālwa on receiving the news of the death of Sultān Mahmūd *khālji*, sent armies to plunder Sōrath, was wounded by an elephant, p 252, advanced to conquer the fort of Jūnāgarh and the hill of Karnāl, distribution of five *hons* of gold among the soldiers, sent troops in every direction to plunder the country, determination for the upliftment of Islam in Jūnāgarh, p 253, fight with Rāj-pūts for the fort of Jūnāgarh, surrendered the fort of Jūnāgarh, besieged the hill of Karnāl, p 254, Rāy Mandalik became humble and surrendered the hill of Karnāl to the Sultān, Rāy Mandalik was converted to Islām and received the title of *Khān Jahān*, foundation of the city of Mustafā-ābād, p 255, gave up the idea of conquering Chāmpānūr, marched against the country of Kach, p 257, accepted the excuses of the people of Kach, marched towards Sind, p 258, possession of Sind, p 259, marched towards Jagat to release the Musalmāns from the oppressions of the *Kāfirs*, arrived at Jagat, p 260, ravaged the temple of Jagat, started for the island of Beyt, captured the citadel of Beyt, Rāy Bhīm fled, entered the city of Beyt,

released all the Musalmāns from prison, left Malik Tūghān as the *thānadār* of Beyt, returned to Mustafā-ābād, p 261, Rāy Bhīm was arrested and brought to the Sultān, sentenced Rāy Bhīm to death, started towards the fort of Chāmpānūr, p 262, sailed to punish the Malābārīs, arrived at the port of Kanbāvat, attacked Chāmpānūr, returned to Ahmadābād, despatched his *amīrs* to the *thānas* of various countries, p 263, appointment of *razār* and engagement with the administration, conspiracy of *Khudāwand Khān* with Rāy Rāvān, p 264, effort of Rāy Rāvān to include Imād ul mulk in the conspiracy, confidential activities of 'Imād-ul mulk against the conspiracy, p 265, failure of the conspiracy, a rumour in Mustafā-ābād, p 266, investigation about the rumour, made a plan to deceive his opponents and his activities according to the plan, pp 267-269, 'Imād-ul mulk disclosed the story of conspiracy, punishment of *Khudāwand Khān*, went to Nahr-wāla, sent 'Imād ul mulk to conquer Jālōr and Sājōr, Mujāhid *Khān* murdered Qaisar *Khān*, p 270, punishment of the murderer of Qaisar *Khān*, favours for the family of 'Imād-ul-mulk after the latter's death, famine in Gujrāt, p 271, Rāy Batāi defeated and killed Malik Sadhā, marched towards Chāmpānūr, Rāja of Chāmpānūr submitted for the pardon of his offences which was not granted, encamped in the village of Karnāli, p 272, conflicting attitude of the Rāj-pūts, siege of the fort of Chāmpānūr, petition of apology from Rāy Batāi to the Sultān, Rāy Batāi asked Sultān

Chiyath ud dīn for help p 273 after consulting the learned men Sultān Chiyath ud dīn gave up the idea of helping Ray Batāl measures and activities for the conquest of the fort of Champanīr conquest of the fort of Champanīr pp 24-276 gave the name of Muhammadabad to Champanīr execution of Ray Batai and Dungarsi order for the construction of citadel palaces and gardens in Champanīr p 276 jagir for Khalil Khan Shahzāda p 277 a *farmān* to the Raja of Ābu in regard to the merchants who were looted by him news about the disobedience of Bahādur Gilānī p 278 sent Malik Qawam ul mulk to punish Bahādur Gilānī Sultān Mahmud Bahmanī marched from Bidar defeated and slew Bahādur Gilānī marched towards Mahra flight of Alf Khan sent Sharf al-Jahan to reassure Alf Khan p 279 sent Qadī Pīr Ishaq to reinforce Malik Shaikhā Alf Khan fought with Qadī Pīr Ishaq on the request Alf Khan was excused owing to the murder of *naib* : *ard* Alf Khan was imprisoned and he died p 280 on arrival of the Sultān Ādil Khan Faruqī paid tribute and was pardoned p 281 postponed his march towards Malwa after hearing the victory of his slave Āyīz over the *Fīrangīs* returned from Dun to Muhammadabad Champanīr p 282 agreed to bestow the dominions of Asir and Burhanpur on Ādil Khan son of Hasan Khan marched towards Asir and Burhanpur heard of the activities of Hisam ud dīn Maghul p 283 advanced to Thalūr sent Āṣaf Khan and Malik Hisam ud dīn to punish Malik Hisam ud dīn and Ālam Khan bestowed the govern-

ment of Asir and Burhanpur on Ādil Khan p 84 marched towards Sultānpur Nadarbar p 285 after hearing of the homicidal accounts of his subordinates he ordered destruction of those who did not observe the rights of salt a petition from Āzam Humayun detailing the hostile account of Shīr Khan and Saif Khan and his siege of the fort of Asir p 287 grant of money to Āzam Humayun assurance of royal aid in case of necessity to Āzam Humayun request of Āzam ul mulk Bahri for Ālam Khanzāda p 288 reply to Āzam ul mulk Sultān Sikandar Ludi of Delhi sent presents to the Sultān travelled towards Nahrwala p 289 paid a visit to the tombs of *sufīs* summoned Shahzāda Muzaffar Khan became ill p 290 died period of reign titles after death p 291 came as a suppliant to Naib Shāh p 444 bestowed the title of Sultān ush-sharq on Malik Sarwar and conferred on him the government of Jaunpur p 447 joined Sultān Ibrahim but was not honoured by the latter went to Kanauj removed the *thanadar* of Kanauj possessed Kanauj p 450 opposed Mallu Khan bravely came and sat on the throne of Delhi marched to engage Sultān Ibrahim Sharqī p 451 made over the government of Sanbal to Asad Khan Ludi and returned to Delhi p 452

Mahmud Shīh Sultan of Gujrat p 383 son of Latīf Khan son of Miran Muhammad Shah sent Mahmud Khan to Gujrat was placed on the throne of Gujrat with the title p 384 of Mahmud Shah

Daryā Khān, took the Sultān to Chāmpānīr, p 385, 'Imād-ul-mulk advanced against the Sultān, advanced towards the country of Sōrath to crush 'Imād-ul-mulk, advanced towards Burhānpūr in pursuit of 'Imād-ul-mulk, Mīrān Mubārak was defeated, Daryā Khān's administration and his actions as the *bādshāh*, p 386, came out of the fort of Ahmadābād and went to 'Ālam Khān Lūdī, 'Ālam Khān Lūdī helped the Sultān march of Daryā Khān towards Dūlqa fight between 'Ālam Khān and Darvā Khān and the defeat of the latter, p 387 departure of messengers to bring Sultān Mahmūd arrived at Ahmadābād and flight of Darvā Khān to Shēr Khān Afghān, p 388, set himself to manage the government, favourable treatment for his men, how Burhān murdered the Sultān and others, p 389, proclamation that Burhān was the heir to the throne, murder of Burhān, period of reign, p 391, character of the Sultān, p 392, his constructive works and peculiar tastes, abolished the improper customs of Gujrāt, p 393

Mahmūd Shāh, Sultān, son of Nāsir Shāh, Sultān of Mālwa was summoned by his father, p 571 was made the heir with the title of Sultān Mahmūd Shāh, p 572, was pained at heart after the speech of Nāsir-ud-dīn Shāh, p 573, his accession on the throne, p 574, sent Jāwash Khān to crush Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, ascended the throne of Khālji Sultāns, p 575, a report from Jāwash Khān, entrusted the management of the affairs of the Kingdom to Basant Rāy, p 576, pride and death of Basant Rāy message

by Sadr Khān and Afdal Khān about the removal of Naqd-ul-mulk, p 577, false report of Muhāfiz Khān against Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān which incited him to issue an order for their execution, p 578, Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān escaped the deceitful attempt of Muhāfiz Khān, p 579, sat on the throne and sent Afdal Khān and Jāwash Khān to put down Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān, death of Sultān Shihāb ud dīn, p 580 title of Hūshang Shāh for the adopted son of Sultān Shihāb ud-dīn, sent Nizām Khān to reinforce Dastūr Khān flight of Hūshang in the hills of Bahār Bābā Hājī, petitions from Iqbāl Khān and Mukhtas Khān about the wickedness of Muhāfiz Khān, p 581 statements of his servants about the evil aims of Muhāfiz Khān, on the order of punishment Muhāfiz Khān revolted against him and attempted to seize him, fled to the town of Ujjain, Muhāfiz Khān placed Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān on the throne, p 582, contracts of Sāhib Khān with Sadr and Afdal Khān, rise of Sāhib Khān, his victory over Sāhib Khān, p 583, advanced towards Shādīābād, p 584 fought with and defeated Sāhib Khān, sent a message to Sāhib Khān for settlement, p 585, refusal by Sāhib Khān of his peace offer defeat and flight of Sāhib Khān, promise of Sultān Muzaffar to Sāhib Khān, p 586 evil aims and actions of Mēdinī Rāy which promoted rebellion, ordered the execution of Afdal Khān and Iqbāl Khān rebellion of Sikandar Khān, p 587, entrusted the office of the *vazārat* to Mēdinī Rāy, wrote to Mansūr Khān to put down Sikandar Khān Mansūr Khān and Sanjār

Khan joined Bihjat Khan sent Medini Ray to put down Sikandar Khan and went to Ujjain p 588 pardoned the offences of Sikandar Khan a petition reached him in Āgar regarding the disturbances in Shadia had received an unfavourable reply from Bihjat Khan petition of Bihjat Khan to Sultan Sikandar Lodi against him p 589 on the report of Bherodas collected troops and encamped in the village of Shikarpur sent Mukhtas Khan to Chandri arrival of Sultan Muzaffar Gujrati with a view to conquering his territory p 590 retreat of Sultan Muzaffar Gujrati deputed Malik Lodha to punish Sikandar Khan in victory of Sikandar Khan over Malik Lodha p 591 advanced for the destruction of Bihjat Khan occupied himself with collecting troops in Sajanpur hearing of the encampment of Said Khan Lodi and Imad ul mulk returned to his own place p 592 captured the town of Bhilsa advance of Malik Mahmud towards Sarangpur and his defeat by Jhujar Khan a message of Said Khan Lodi and Imad ul mulk to Bihjat Khan p 593 advance of Khwajah Jahan and Muhafiz Khan towards Shadia bad deputed Habib Khan Fakhr ul mull and Hemkaran to put down Muhafiz Khan fatal defeat of Muhafiz Khan submission of the rebel and his bestowals upon them p 594 dishonesty of Bihjat Khan towards Sahib Khan p 595 hearing of the flight of Sahib Khan came to Chandri details of his tyranny on the Musalmans of his territory p 596 sent Āraish Khan with a message to Medini Ray reply of the Rajputs and the proposal of Medini Ray p 597 submission of Medini Ray

accepted the request of Medini Ray disobedience of Salbahan p 598 had a consultation for the execution of Medini Ray and Salbahan combat with the Rajputs p 599 suppression of the tumult his conclusion from the message of Medini Ray being fed up with the Rajputs fled to Sultan Muzaffar Gujrati p 600 the efforts of Sultan Muzaffar brought him again to Malwa putting the enemies to death p 602 retreat of Rana Sanka p 604 invited Sultan Muzaffar to come to the fort of Shadiabad departure of Sultan Muzaffar summoned his *amirs sardars* and soldiers advanced to attack Hemkaran in the fort of Kakrun p 605 his defeat in the fight with Rana Sanka and the latter's kindness to him p 606 retirement of the Gujrati troops from Malwa the whole of his territory was occupied by his enemies p 608 a portion of Malwa under the possession of Rana Sanka ended the violence of Silhadi returned to Mandu submission of Silhadi p 609 showed respect to Chand Khan efforts of Radi ul mull to transfer the rule of Gujrat from Sultan Bahadur to Chand Khan Ratan Sen advanced into Malwa summoned Mu'in Khan and Silhadi to his aid conferred a title and honour on Mu'in Khan p 610 gave some *parganas* to Silhadi sent Darya Khan to wait on Sultan Bahadur with a message reply of Sultan Bahadur marched from Ujjain towards Satwas his servants joined Sultan Bahadur p 611 invasion of Sultan Bahadur and the latter's victory p 612 was kept in imprisonment with all his sons attack of Ray Singh on the camp of

- Āsaf Khān and Iqbāl Khān, attained martyrdom, p 614, period of reign, p 615
- Mahmūd Turk, Malik, p 203
- Mahram Bēg, was sent to conquer Kashmīr by Mīrzā Kāmran, p 700.
- Mahta, Malik, joined Nāsir-ud-dīn, p 558, was nominated by Nāsir-ud-dīn to crush Yakān Khān, p 560, was sent to bring Miyān Manjhla, p 564
- Majd-ud-dīn, Khawājah, p 124
- Mājhi Khōkhar, Malik, surrendered the fort of Khānawāl, p 793
- Makhdūma-ī-Jahān, directed all her energies in furnishing the bed of equity and justice, administration of Nizām Shāh was entrusted to her hands, p 86; refused to send Shāhzāda Fath Khān for the throne of Dāūd Shāh, p 237, design of Mahmūd Shāh for the possession of her territory, p 259
- Makna Mughal, fought with the Kīsh-t-wārā army as the commander of Mīrzā Haidar's troops, p 711.
- Makta, Mir, joined Mīrzā Haidar, p 716
- Mal, Rāy, Rāja of Idar, retired to the hills of Bijānagar, had a fight with Nizām-ul-mulk, p 300, advanced to Idar, p 301, the news of his raid reached Muzaffar Shāh, his territory was destroyed by Muzaffar Shāh, p 306
- Malhū, Malik, defeated the army of Shujā'at Khān, p 559
- Malik Shāh Turk, Khawājah Jahān, was given the title of Khawājah Jahān and sent to Tilang by Humāyūn Shāh, besieged the fort of Deor Konda, did not appreciate the opinion of Nizām-ul-mulk, was defeated by the Rāy of Orissa, joined Humāyūn Shāh and gave a false reason for his defeat, p 79, was made over to a jailor by Humāyūn Shāh, p 80, was made over to the army of Nizām Shāh, p 88, seized the bridle of the horse of Nizām Shāh and turned towards Bidar, p 89, was sent with a large army to fight with Sultān Mahmūd Khālji, p 90, pursued Mahmūd Khālji, returned via Gōndwārā, ordered the Rājas of Gōndwārā to be put to death, p 91
- Malik-ul-Mashāikh, Qādī, his son fought with Alf Khān, p 280
- Malik-ush-shaiq, p 486, was summoned by Mahmūd Khālji, p 502
- Malik-ut-tujjār, the son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, and the governor of Junīr, went with his father to Gujrāt, p 75 (and see note on p 75)
- Malik-ut-tujjār, Khawājah Jahān Khawājah Mahmūd Gīlānī, plundered the Khālji camp, p 88, was sent by Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī to conquer the territory of the Rāy of Sangēsar and Kokan, was reinforced by As'ad Khān and Kīshwar Khān in Kolāpūr, fought with the enemy in the vicinity of Kaikanā, p 97, seized the fort of Rangta, captured the fort of Māchal, message of submission by the Rāy of Sonkar, p 98, conquered the island of Goa, came to the capital where he was granted the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn Khawājah Jahān, p 99, informed Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī about the disobedience of Birkāna Rāy, p 101, the territory of Birkāna Rāy was entrusted to him by Muhammad Shāh, p 102, conspiracy which resulted in his murder, p 107, his literary qualification and work, p 108
- Maltha, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his government, p 774

Malkah : Jahan mother of Nizam Shah being apprised of the treachery of Khwajah Jahan entrusted the defence of the fort of Bidar to Mallu Khan and took Nizam Shah with her to Firuzabad p 89 (and see note 1 p 89) p 53

Malka : Jahan mother of Sultan Shahab ud din Mahmud p 112

Malkah : Jahan wife of Sultan Husain Sharqi instigated Sultan Husain for the conquest of Delhi p 460 was seized by the men of Sultan Bahlul who sent her to Sultan Husain induced Sultan Husain to fight with Sultan Bahlul p 461

Mallu Iqbal Khan advanced towards Jaunpur p 448 on the way arrived at Kanauj again advanced towards Kanauj took Sultan Mahmud with him p 449 ran away from his own camp and joined Sultan Ibrahim p 450 went to Jaunpur and Delhi leaving Kanauj to Sultan Mahmud again came to besiege Kanauj returned unsuccessful to Delhi was slain by Khidr Khan p 401

Mallu Khan see Mallu Khan Qadir Shah Sultan of Malwa

Mallu Khan brother of Ibrahim Adil Khan request to Asa d Khan p 161 was made Sultan by Asa d Khan was arrested by Ibrahim Adil Khan and blinded p 162

Mallu Khan son of Mallu Khan see Mallu Khan Qadir Shah Sultan of Malwa

Mallu Khan Qadir Shah Sultan of Malwa was appointed as the defender of the fort of Bidar by Malkah : Jahan pp 89 535 was given Sarangpur by Sultan Bahadur pp 358 616 gave protection to Imad ul mulk p 386 was appointed by Nasir ud din to defeat Sher Khan p 567 gave himself the

title of Qadir Shah took the town of Bhilsa in the vicinity of the Narbada river into his possession Bhu pat Ray and Puran Mal took possession of the fort of Raisin development of his power a farman from Sher Khan of Bengal p 617 reply to Sher Khan representation of Saif Khan Dehlaui his reply to Saif Khan p 618 period of his occupation of Malwa advice of Saif Khan his submission to Sher Khan in favour with Sher Khan p 619 brought his family to Ujjain his flight from Sher Khan period of reign p 60

Mallu Qadir Khan governor of Malwa fled towards Mandu p 374

Man Ray the Ray of Orissa left him in the fort of Rajmandri surrendered the fort to Sultan Lashkari p 104

Mandalik Ray asked pardon for his offences from Mahmud Shah the news of his pride reached Mahmud Shah who sent a strong army against him p 200 presented valuable ornaments and large tribute to the amirs of Mahmud Shah p 251 his humble representation to and the reply from Mahmud Shah p 53 fled and retired into the fort of Junagarh fight with the army of Mahmud Shah proposal of peace which was accepted surrendered the fort of Junagarh and took shelter in the hills of Karnal p 204 joined the service of Mahmud Shah and surrendered the hills of Karnal his wish to become a Musalman was granted the title of Khan Jahan by Mahmud Shah p 255

Manhi Khan was sent with a message to Nasir ud din by Ghayath ud din p 556

Manik Dev Raja of Jammu was reinforced by Adam Khan p 674

Mān Singh, Rāja, Yūsuf Khān had an interview with him, p 756

Mansūr Khān, informed Sultān Ahmad of the advance of Mahmūd Khālji, p 504, reply of Mēdinī Rāy, joined Bihjat Khān, p 588, proclaimed Sāhib Khān as the Sultān, p 592, his agent plundered the army of Mahmūd Shāh, p 593

Mansūr-ul-mulk, was appointed to destroy Mandisōr by Mahmūd Khālji, p 528

Maqbūl Khān, was sent by Mahmūd Khālji towards the fort of Kehrla, p. 536, his victory over Ghāzī Khān, p 537, news of his revolt reached Mahmūd Khālji, p 540

Marjān, Malik, was sent with presents to Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt by Nasīb Shāh, p 444, joined Sultān Ibrāhīm, p 451

Masa'ūd Khān, fled from Mālwa and came to Ahmad Shāh for protection, p 222

Mashhadī, Sayyid Mirzā-i-, p 114

Mashīr-ul-mulk, took a message from Ghīyāth-ud-dīn to Nāsir-ud-dīn, p. 556, was sent to arrange for peace, p 561

Mashīr-ul-mulk, Malik, placed Shāh-zāda Mas'ūd Khān on the throne of Mālwa, p 494, was given the title of Nizām-ul-mulk and the post of *vazīrat* by Mahmūd Khālji, p 497, went in pursuit of the conspirators, p 498, was sent to reconnoitre the roads, p 505, his hostility, p 525, was sent by Mahmūd Khālji to the Deccan for confirmation of peace, p 538

Mas'ūd, was killed by Shēr, p 660

Mas'ūd, son of Malik Kājī, attacked Iskandar Khān and was slain, p 694

Mas'ūd Khān, Shāh-zāda, was placed on the throne of Mālwa by the

efforts of *amīrs* and *sardārs*, p 494, took sanctuary with Shaikh Jāildah, p 495, was sent by Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī to conquer Mālwa, p 501, Sultān Ahmad promised to recover Mālwa for him next year, p 506

Mas'ūd Nāyak, Khawājah, defeated Sankar, p. 741, slew Bahādur Khān, seized Khān Zamān, bestowal of the title of Husam Khān on him, p 744, his imprisonment, p 745

Mawadab Khān, fort of Shādīābād under his control, p 583

Mēdinī Rāy, hearing of the advance of Muzaffar Shāh proceeded to Dhār, went to Rānā Sānkā to beg for help, sent a letter to Rāy Pithorā giving an account of his preparations, p 303, brought Rānā Sānkā to aid Bhīm Karan Pūrabīa, p 307, was sent to Silhadi with a message by Rānā Sānkā, p 315, joined Mahmūd Shāh, p 583, wounded Sāhib Khān, p 585, his false representation to Mahmūd Shāh against the Amīrs, p 587, was made *vazīr*, his reply to Mansūr Khān, was sent to put down Sikandar Khān, p 588, his wicked instigation of Mahmūd Shāh and its results, p 596, his advice to the Rājput̃s in connection with rebellion, p 597, his submission to Mahmūd Shāh, p 598, was wounded by a servant of Mahmūd Shāh, p 599, suppressed the tumult of the Rājput̃s, sent a petition to Mahmūd Shāh and was reappointed to his post, p 600, went to Chitōr to bring Rānā Sānkā, p 602, request to Rānā Sānkā, p 606

Mirak Haravī, Khawājah, minister of Murtada Nizām Shāh, p 145, was given the title of Chengīz Khān, conquered Berār and annexed it to the territories of Murtāda Nizām

- Gwāliar, p 479, agreement of peace with Sultān Hūshang, p 480
- Mubārak Shāh Sharqī, succeeded Sultān-ush-Sharq, p 448, collected an army to oppose Mallū Iqbāl Khān, both retired without an engagement to their countries, on hearing of the advance of Mallū Iqbāl Khān he again began to collect an army, his death, period of reign, p 449
- Mubārīz Khān 'Adalī, conferred the country of Mālwa on Shujā' Khān, p 628
- Mubārīz-ul-mulk, Malīk, was appointed to the government of Īdar by Muzaffar Shāh, heard about the bravery of Rānā Sānkā from a bard, gave the name of Rānā Sānkā to a dog and kept it tied up at the gate of Īdar, p 307, sent an account to Muzaffar Shāh about the violence of Rānā Sānkā, was condemned by the *vazīrs* of Muzaffar Shāh, p 308, instead of fighting with Rānā Sānkā, he, according to the advice of the *sardārs* came to Ahmadnagar, advice of a bard to him, his reply to the bard, his fight with Rānā Sānkā in which he was wounded, p 309, retired to Ahmadābād, p 310, came with an army to Ahmadnagar to bury the martyrs, was attacked by the *kōlīs* and the *grāssias* but was victorious, p 311, advanced to fight with Rānā Sānkā, p 316
- Mufarraḥ Pīdar Habshī, was sentenced to death, p 564
- Mughīth, Malīk, Khān Jahān, decided to support Sultān Hūshang, the request of Mūsa Khān, p 471, was given a title and rank by Sultān Hūshang, p 472, requested Sultān Hūshang to pardon Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān, kept Fath Khān, 'Uthmān Khān and Haibat Khān in confinement under the orders of Sultān Hūshang, p 482, rendered homage to Ghaznīn Khān, was given the title of Masnad 1. 'Alī Khān Jahān by Ghaznīn Khān, p. 491, was nominated by Sultān Muhammad Shāh to punish the Rājput̃s of Hārūtī, p 492, his reply to Mahmūd Khān in connection with the accession to the throne of Mālwa, p 496, was given the title of Ā'zam Humāyūn and honour by his son Mahmūd Khālījī, p 497, requested Mahmūd Khālījī to pardon the conspirators, was sent to suppress the rebels by Mahmūd Khālījī, p 499, sent wise men with advice to Ahmad Khān, advanced to overthrow Malīk Anchhā, p 500, asked the Saīyids to describe the behaviour of Nasrat Khān, transferred the government of Chandēri from Nasrat Khān, entered the fort of Mandū, p 501
- Mughīth Khālījī, Malīk, p 238
- Muhāfiz Khān, was put to death by Rānī Khurshīd and Shujā'at Khān, p 562
- Muhāfiz Khān, *Khawājah Sarā*, did not allow Shihāb-ud-dīn to enter the gates of Nasratābād, p 574, his report to Mahmūd Shāh against the *amīrs*, p 578, instigated Mahmūd Shāh to seize Mukhtas Khān and Iqbāl Khān, p 579, was given a rank and title, p 580, his victorious revolt, placed Shāhzāda Sāhib Khān on the throne of Mahmūd Shāh, p 582, his flight from Shahrāī, p 584, his defeat and flight, p 586, his fatal defeat, p 594
- Muhāfiz Khān Jadīd, was sentenced to death, p 564
- Muhammad, son of Sultān Hasan, his education was entrusted to Malīk Yārī Bhat, p 680

- Muhammad Malik son of Ahmad
 Ṣilah was summoned by Mahmud
 Khaljī p 50
- Muhammad Qadī went as an ambas-
 sador to Sulṭān Muzaḥfar Gujrātī
 his description of the palaces of
 the Sulṭāns of Gujrat p 197
- Muhammad Saiyyid was honoured by
 Sultan Sikandar p 647
- Muhammad Saiyyid Quṭbī Ālam
 Sulṭān Quṭb ud dīn went to see
 him p 934 said to Sulṭān Quṭb ud
 dīn that the dynasty of Muzaḥfar
 Shah would be maintained by his
 younger brother p 235
- Muhammad Saiyyid son of Saiyyid
 Hasan guarded Muhammad Shah
 p 683 his fortifications p 686
 joined Fath Khan p 689
- Muhammad Sulṭān was left in the
 fort of Sewī by Shah Beg was killed
 by Mubarak Khan p 778
- Muhammad Atka Mir celebrated
 Khan Kalan was sent by Khalifa
 Iltūṭ to conquer Sirohi p 413
- Muhammad Bakha Malik was given
 the title of Chāzi Khan by
 Mahmud Shah and was sent in
 attendance on Āḡam Humayun
 p 285 left Burhanpur and took his
 residence in Thalnūr fled p 286
 was slain p 287
- Muhammad Baq Mirza ruler of
 Sindh account of his reign p 785
- Muhammad Bhat incited Yusuf to
 rebel against Husam Khan p 747
 his imprisonment p 750 brought
 Lohar to the presence of Yusuf
 Khan p 757
- Muhammad Chak son of Kaḡi Chak
 his death p 710
- Muhammad Farnah Shaikh brought
 a message from Sulṭān Bahlul Lūdī
 to Mahmud Khaljī p 54
- Muhammad Gisu daraz Amir Saiyyad
 a great Sufī of the time and the
 disciple of Shaikh Naṣir ud dīn
 Muhammad Daudī came from
 Delhi Sulṭān Firuz Shah wel-
 comed him his holiness the Saiyyad
 settled down at Gulbarga p 37
 the Saiyyad informed Firuz Shah
 that Khan Khānān Shahzada Ahmad
 Khan was destined to succeed him
 instead of his son Hasan Khan
 p 38
- Muhammad Haidar his flight p 734
- Muhammad Harun advanced towards
 Mekran p 61 sent the letter of
 Hajjaj to Ray Dahr p 763
- Muhammad Khan was directed to
 obey Shahu Khan p 600 was made
 a councillor by Sulṭān Zam ul
 abidin p 652 was appointed as
 the successor of Sulṭān Zam ul
 abidin p 660 was made the com-
 mander of a detachment p 696
 his representation to Mirza Kamran
 p 700 his imprisonment p 757 was
 seized and punished p 758
- Muhammad Khan son of Sher Khan
 Fuladī came into the city of Ah-
 madabad and offered congratulations
 to the murderers of Chengiz Khan
 p 409 governed Bangala for a time
 his son gave himself the title of
 Sultan Bahadur and ruled there
 p 445
- Muhammad Khan son of Sultan Ahmad
 Dakinī was made over to Shahzada
 Ala ud dīn by Ahmad Shah p 48
 (and see note 2 on p 48) was
 sent by Sultan Ala ud dīn to
 conquer Bijanagar p 58 (and see
 note 1 on p 58) put the innocent
 Malik Imad ul mulk to death was
 defeated by Ala ud dīn fled in
 disgrace p 59 received farman of
 Ala ud dīn went to Rajpur and
 retired there p 60
- Muhammad Khan son of Ādil Khan
 the ruler of Asir and Burhanpur was

- reinforced by 'Imād-ul-mulk Kāwīlī, p 135
- Muhammad Khān, Saiyid, rendered tribute to Mahmūd Khālji, p 520
- Muhammad Khān, Shāhzāda, was appointed by Ahmad Shāh to inquire about the act of plundering of Kānhā, defeated the Dakinī troops, p 213, advanced towards Daulatābād to give battle, fought with Sultān 'Alā ud-dīn and defeated him, returned from Daulatābād and halted in the town of Nadasbār from where he informed his father and received his directions, p 214, received a special favour from Ahmad Shāh, sent a representation to Ahmad Shāh, p 217
- Muhammad Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Sultān Ahmad Gujrātī, his advancement towards Sārangpūr, p 503, left Sārangpūr for Ujjain, p 504
- Muhammad Khān Asirī, waited upon Sultān Bahādur at Sambla, p 351, was posted to the west of the battery of Shāhpūr, p 353, was sent by Sultān Bahādur for the chastisement of Bhūpat and Rānā, p 362, arrived in the vicinity of Kahrār and informed Sultān Bahādur about the enemy in that place, p 363, was appointed to capture the fort of Kākrūn by Sultān Bahādur, p 367
- Muhammad Khān Chak, seized Lōhar Chak, went to Haidar Khān, p 750, slew Islām Khān, p 751, was slain, p 753
- Muhammad Khān Mākri, went with a message of Saiyid Mubārak Khān to Yūsuf Khān, p 754, joined the enemies of Mubārak Khān, p 755
- Muhammad Khān Mākri, son of Abdāl Mākri, his marriage, p 721, was granted a fief by Husain Khān, his plans against Husain Khān, p 741, his imprisonment, p 742, was blinded, p 744
- Muhammad Khān Qandahāī, Shāh, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p 631
- Muhammad Lārī Khawāja, author of Sirāj-ut-Tawārīkh, p 4
- Muhammad Mākri, fought with Kisht-wārā army as the commander of Mīrzā Haidar's troop, p 711, was slain with his son, p 712
- Muhammad Nazr, Rājauī was made over to him by Mīrzā Haidar, p 712, his imprisonment, p 715, his release, p 722
- Muhammad Qāsim, 'Imād-ud-dīn, was sent to conquer Sind, p 764, his victories, p 765, defeated Bachhrā, p 766, his fight with Rāy Dāhr, p 767, conquest of Rāwar, p 770, account of his death, p 771
- Muhammad Qāsim Budhū, Shaikh, was requested by Muzaffar Shāh to pray for the victory of Islām, p 187
- Muhammad Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk, his succession to the throne, fell in love with a prostitute, laid the foundation of Bhāgnagar, his period of reign, p 171
- Muhammad Rūmī, p 718
- Muhammad Ṣadūr, was killed by Haidar Chak, p 736
- Muhammad Sālih 'Āql, went as an ambassador to Yūsuf Khān, p 758
- Muhammad Samarqandī, Maulānā, p 259, narrated his story to Mahmūd Shāh of having been looted, was treated kindly, sent to Ahmadābād, and helped financially by Mahmūd Shāh, was assured and consoled by Mahmūd Shāh, p 260, was sent for by the order of Mahmud Shāh from Ahmadābād, p 262
- Muhammad Shāh, son of Humāyūn Shāh, ascended the throne of Dakin,

gave himself the title of Muhammad Shah Tark-i enlisted a thousand Turki slaves among his servants granted p 93 Kawi to Imad ul mulk Junir to Nizam ul mulk and Mahur to Khudawand Khan as Jagirs p 94 appointed Malik Nizam ul mulk to conquer the fort of Kehrli p 95 sent Malik ut tujjar to conquer the territory of the Ray of Sonkar and Kahan p 97 Ray of Sonkar surrendered the fort of Kalkanfa to Malik ut tujjar p 98 conferred the title of Iqan Humayun Khwajah Jahan on Malik ut tujjar p 99 sent Iqbal Khan to capture the fort of Birakar conferred that territory on Iqbal Khan as Jagir p 100 Malik ut tujjar Khwajah Jahan reported about the rebellion of Birkana Ray besieged the fort of Birkana p 101 the Ray offered allegiance excused the Ray entrusted the country of the Ray to Khwajah Jahan and returned to the capital the Ray of Orissa p 102 plundered and devastated part of the Deccan and retired to his country sent Malik Nizam ul mulk to punish the Ray of Orissa instead of going p 103 towards Orissa Nizam ul mulk went towards Zirbad marched and arrived near Rajmundri left Khwajah Jahan in attendance on the Shah da went to Rajmundri arrived on the bank of the river nominated Darya Khan to pursue the Ray of Orissa encamped around the fort of Rajmundri Ray Man asked for protection and surrendered the fort confirmed Ray Man in the possession of the fort and its neighbourhood returned to the capital p 104 started for Tilang besieged the fort of Kandar thanadar of Kandar became

loyal and surrendered the fort advanced to the ports of Narsingh Ray took tribute from the Ray and retired to his capital ordered erection of a fort for thanadars amirs reported about Kanji p 105 arrived at Kanji the soldiers ravaged Kanji returned to the capital heard a rumor against Khwajah Jahan p 106 the enemies of Khwajah Jahan proved the rumor by a forged letter without asking explanation the Khwajah was put to death p 107 fell ill and died period of reign p 109 Muhammad Shah son of Hushang Shah Ghuri Sultan of Malwa helped Nizam in besieging the fort of Talnir p 108 on the arrival of Ahmad Shah's army retired to his country p 109 killed the elephant of Ahmad Shah's army p 110 treatment of his brother p 181 was declared as the heir of Sultan Hushang p 183 sent a message to Mahmud Khan p 184 having heard about the intention of the amirs sent another message to Mahmud Khan p 185 fled to Kakrun sent a message to Mahmud Khan wrote a letter to Malik Mughith p 188 enshrouded the corpse of Sultan Hushang by the order of Mahmud Khan and was proclaimed as the successor of Sultan Hushang confirmation of his accession p 190 succeeded his father by the exortions of Malik Mughith and Mahmud Khan and received the title of Mahmud Shah conferred the title of Masnad-i Ali Khan Jahan on p 191 Malik Mughith and kept him in the rank of vazir shed much unrighteous blood which caused the downfall of his empire the Rajputs revolted against him nominated Khan Jahan to punish the

- Rājapūts, p 492, had a conversation with Mahmūd Khān about the conspiracy of which he had heard, p 493, he was killed by being poisoned, p 494
- Muhammad Shāh, Ghiyās-ud-dunyā-wad-dīn, Gujrātī, succeeded his father, description of the day of coronation, known as *Zar-bakhsh*, had a son born to him, p 223, advanced to Idar to devastate it, Rāy Har offered his daughter in the shape of tribute, gave the fort of Idar to Har Rāy, advanced towards Bākur, Ganēsā, the Rāja of Dūngarpūr, did homage to the Sultān, returned to Ahmadābād, p 224, advanced to conquer the fort of Chāmpānī, Rāy Kank Dās fought with the Sultān but fled and re entered the fort, p 225, retired towards Ahmadābād, stopped in Kothia, collected reinforcements, death, period of reign, title after death, p 226
- Muhammad Shāh, Mirān, ruler of Asir and Burhānpūr, p 381, according to the wish of Sultān Bahādur, Mirān Muhammad Shāh was selected as the Sultān, p 382, the *Khutba* was read and the *Sikka* was struck in his name in his absence, died of natural death, p 383
- Muhammad Shāh, Mirān, son of Mirān Mubārak Shāh, advanced to defeat Chengīz Khān, p 402, pursued Chengīz Khān as far as Nadarbār, p 403, advanced to conquer the kingdom of Gujrāt but was defeated by Chengīz Khān, p 405
- Muhammad Shāh, Sultān, son of 'Alā-ud dīn Hasan Shāh, succeeded his father, assumed the title of Sultān Muhammad Shāh, p 11, advanced towards Bilampatan, seized and annexed many villages and towns, p 13, the Rāy of Bilampatan shut the gates of the fort, conquest of the fort of Bilampatan, returned to Gulbarga, p 14, news of the rapid advance of and seizure of the Rāy of Bijānagar, p 15, advanced to punish the Rāy of Bijānagar, the Rāy fled and took shelter in a fort, besieged the fort, fought with the Rāy, and he returned after success to Gulbarga, the rebellion of Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy, p 16, brought him to Deogarh, Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy went to Shaikh Rukn-ud-dīn, p 17, visited Rukn-ud-dīn at Daulatābād, excused Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy on the recommendation of Rukn-ud-dīn, Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy went away to Gujrāt, made arrangements at Deogarh, returned to Gulbarga, pleased his subjects, account of death, p 18, period of reign, p 19, and see note 2, p 18
- Muhammad Shāh, Sultān, (grandson of Bahman Shāh), succeeded Dāūd Khān, p 22, the *thānadār*, p 23, of the fort of Sāghir rebelled against him, marched against the *thānadār* and defeated him, his death, period of reign, p 24
- Muhammad Shāh, Sultān, son of Sultān Hasan Shāh, Sultān of Kashmir, attained to sovereignty, disputes between the Saiyids and the Kashmiris, p 682, banished Saiyid 'Alī Khān and other Saiyids from Kashmir, efforts of Fath Khān to regain his ancestral dominions, p 686, fight with Fath Khān and the latter's defeat, invasions of Fath Khān, p 687, was imprisoned by Fath Khān, period of reign, treatment of Fath Khān, p 689, was released and escaped,

p 690 defeated Fath Shah and ascended the throne of Kashmir for the second time his *ta'ar* his successor not being able to oppose Fath Shah took to flight p 691 period of his reign for the second time attacked Fath Shah and defeated him his accession for the third time p 692 order for the executions of the *amirs* of Fath Shah order for the corpse of Fath Shah p 693 skirmishes with Iskandar *Khan* turned against Malik Kaji p 694 entrusted the post of *ta'arat* to Malik Kaji blinded Iskandar *Khan* his imprisonment p 695 period of his reign for the third time p 696 his accession to the throne of Kashmir for the fourth time p 699 agreement of peace with Kashgharis p 704 his death period of reign p 705

Muhammad Shah Lashkari *see* Muhammad Shah (son of Humayun Shah)

Muhammad Tughlaq Shah Sultan various kinds of disturbances in his kingdom and their causes p 1 rebellion of *amirs* Sadha advanced towards Gujrat in order to suppress the rebellion sent Malik Lajin to summon the *amirs* of hundreds of Daulatabad *amirs* of hundreds slew Malik Lajin and seized all the property of Daragarh p could not suppress Ala ud din died 796 A.H. in the neighbourhood of Thatha pp 3 177 hearing the news of the sovereignty of Ismail Fath marched from Bahroj to put him down fought with the rebels and defeated them halted at Daragarh nominated Imad ul mulk for overthrowing Hasan left some *amirs* for protecting the fort of Daragarh marched towards Guj

rat p 9 at first wanted to overthrow Tahir p 10 conferred the fief of Gujrat on Alam Humayun Zafar *Khan* p 173 the titles which were written for Zafar *Khan* p 174 Muhammad Yahya Mirza fought with the Kishtwara army as the commander of Mirza Haider's troops p 711

Muhammad Yusuf Mulla the *Khatib* of the Jama Mosque of Srinagar p 709

Muhammad Zamin Mirza fled from the court of Humayun Bahadur and came as a suppliant to Sultan Bahadur p 369

Muhub Ali *Khan* was sent to conquer Malwa by Akbar p 631

Muhub ul mulk was sent by Sultan Bahadur to bring Latif *Khan* p 341

Muhubb ud din Habib ul lah Amirzada p 80 escaped from the prison of Humayun Shah went to the house of a barber arranged terms with Hasan *Khan* p 82 turned towards Bijapur Siraj *Khan* behaved towards him with courtesy but led him and his friends to death, p 83 separated himself from the army of Nizam Shah and defeated the Ray of Orissa p 87 (also *see* note 3 of p 86)

Muhsin was appointed as the governor of great Tibet by Mirza Haider p 712

Mu'in *Khan* son of Sikandar *Khan* of Satwas was summoned by Mahmud Shah and honours bestowed on him p 610 joined Sultan Bahadur p 611

Mu'in ud din Sanjari Khwajah Zafar *Khan* performed a pilgrimage to his tomb pp 179 3-1 528

Mu'in ul mulk *see* Taj ud-din Malik

Mujahud *Khan* son of Sham *Khan* Dandan took possession of Nagor

- p 229, was unable to defeat Rānā Kūmbhā, asked help from Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī, p 230
- Mujāhid Khān, son of Khudāwand Khān, in concert with Sāhib Khān he murdered Qaisai Khān, p 270, fled with his family, p 271
- Mujāhid Shāh, son of Sultān Muhammad Shāh, succeeded his father, attitude towards his subjects, marched towards Bijānagai, p 19, age of his accession, p 19, n 1, plundered portion of Bijānagar, Kishan Rāy, p 20, became submissive and surrendered the forts of Bijānagar, on the way to his kingdom plundered the rebels who were stationed on a hill, the cause of the hostility of Dāūd Khān and its result, period of reign, p 21, difference of opinion about his reign and the real cause of enmity of Dāūd Khān, p 21, n 1
- Mujāhid-ul-mulk Gujrātī, was left in the service of Ā'zam Humāyūn by Mahmūd Shāh, p 285
- Mukhlīs, was sent to the frontier district of Bangāla by Sultān Fakhr-ud-dīn, p 419
- Mukhlīs-ul-mulk, Malīk, was sent by Ahmad Shāh to punish Nasir, captured Nādōt, p 199, was granted Dīpālpūr Banharia by Ahmad Shāh as *jāgīr* p 205, was ordered by Ahmad Shāh to attend on Zafar Khān with ships collected from all ports, came and waited on Zafar Khān with ships from various ports in the neighbourhood of Mahām, p 215
- Mukhtas Khān, sent a message to Mahmūd Shāh, p 577, his flight from his residence, p 579, sent the corpse of Shihāb-ud-dīn to Shādīābād, p 580, sent a petition to Mahmūd Shāh, p 581, joined Mahmūd Shāh, p 582, was sent with a large army to Chandērī, p 590, fled towards Chandērī, p 592
- Mūkul, Rāna, the Rāja of Dilwāra, fought with Firūz Khān, p 194, was destroyed by Ahmad Shāh, p 220
- Mūnjā Baqāl, complained to Rānī Khuishid, p 554, was slain, p 555
- Muqbal Khān, was sent to Chāmpānīr to punish Silhādī, p 355
- Muqbīl Khān, his flight from Mandesōr, p 565
- Muqīm, Mirzā, his arrival at Kashmir, insulted and tortured the *Muftīs* who had decided the execution of Yūsuf, p 746, his execution, p 747
- Murtada, Mir, his designation, his actions, pp 147, 148
- Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk, succeeded his father, Khwājah Mirak Harvī (of Herāt) who was his minister, p 145, was known as Changīz Khān, conquest of Changīz Khān for Murtada Nizām-ul-mulk, death of Chengīz Khān, relationship with Musāhib Khān, his *vakīl*, actions of Musāhib Khān towards the subjects and the *amīrs*, p 146, death of Musāhib Khān led Murtada Nizām Shāh to a state of madness, separated himself from the administration and retired in Bāgh-i-Bihisht, Khalifa-i-Ilāhī sent Pishrau Khān to the Deccan, p 147, interview of Asad Khān Rūmī with Pishrau Khān, Murtada Nizām Shāh offered his faithful services to Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, rebellion of Burhān, defeat of Burhān, Burhān received imperial favours from Khalifa-i-Ilāhī, Murtada Nizām Shāh again secluded himself in the garden in the year 996, Salābat Khān became the minister of Murtada, enmity of *Jāgīrdār amīrs* of Berār against Salābat Khān and its result, p 148,

- Murtada Nizam ul mulk became ena-
moured of a prostitute by the
name of Fattu Isma il became the
vakil of Nizam Shah and put
Şalabat Khan in prison p 149
Isma il and Fattu assumed full
power Mirza Khan his *nayib* made
himself the *takil* of Murtada re-
leased his son Miran Husain p 150
death of Murtada and the period of
his reign p 151
- Murtada Sharwanı Sairıd a friend of
Mirza Khan his action in a feast
settlement with Mirza Khan p 152
his duties in the fort p 153 his
decision his proclamation was put
to death p 154
- Musa Maulana p 209 his request to
Ahmad Shah not to fight with
Sultan Hushang p 203
- Musa Qadı brought Lohar in the
presence of Yusuf Khan p 757
- Musa Khan was made leader by the
people of Malwa p 187 was made
the chief of the Malwa army p 410
his disappointment and message
to Malik Mu_{hith} p 471 evacuated
the fort of Dhar p 472
- Musa Khan Fuladı joined Sultan
Ahmad p 395 the dı tr et of Patta-
as far as harı came into his posses-
sion p 398 defeated İtmad
Khan p 400
- Musa Zina İdi Zina was bur ed in his
mausoleum p 725
- Musahib Khan his reality i s relat ons
with Murtada Nizam Shah lu rank
his attitude towards the common
people and the *amirs* p 146 his
attacks on the *amir* of Berar his
death p 147
- Mu_{stafa} Malik son of Shuja Khan
bestowal of the title of Shuja Khan
on him p 68 was defeated by Baz
Bahadur p 699
- Mu_{stafa} Khan was put to death p 166
(and see n 1 p 171)
- Mu_{stafa} Rumı p 347 he with his
men was received with favour by
Sultan Bahadur p 348
- Muwafiq Khan joined Nasir ud dın
p 562 was sent to conquer the fort
of Mandu p 563
- Muzaffar Sultān of Gujrat was raised
to the throne p 297 distribution of
jagirs among the *amirs* of Gujrat
p 398 attitude of İtmad Khan
towards the Sultan and his acti-
vities in administration mutiny
of the *amirs* p 399 went and took
up his abode in his own palace
p 410 went to Ulugı Khan at
Ghyaspur a letter from İtmad
Khan to Sher Khan about the Sultān
p 412 Sairıd Hamid rendered
homage to the Sultān p 413 period
of reign p 414
- Muzaffar İbrahim Malik Malik ush
sharq Chanderı was allotted to him
in fief by Mahmud Khalı p 507
defeated Malik Kalu seized the
inhabitants of Ratah advanced
towards Barhar p 518
- Muzaffar Khan his attack on the army
of Sultan Qutb ud dın p 524
- Muzaffar Khan Shahzada came from
the town of Baroda and obtained
seven *lakhs* of *tanlas* towards the
expens es of Ā zam Humayun from
his father p 288 was summoned
by Mahmud Shah p 290
- Muzaffar Shah Sultan Gujratı suc-
ceeded his father sent the body of
his father to the tomb of Shaikh
Almad Khattu distributed wealth
among the deserving conferred
honours and titles upon the *amirs*
p 9 appointed Malik Rashid ul
mulk to the post of *va ir* sent the
amirs and *va ir* to welcome İadgar
Beg Qazlbash favours shown to

Qazilbash changed the name of Muhammadābād into Daulatabād, sent Muhāfiz khān to receive Shāhib khān, p. 293, entertained Shāhib khān at Baroda, ordered Qasr khān to submit an account of the ruler of Mālwa, expressed his wish to Shāhib khān to recover any part of the kingdom of Mālwa from Sultān Mahmūd khān and make it over to him, p. 294, intended to punish the Rājputs who were creating disturbance, went to Ahmadābād p. 295, advanced to Kōdhrāh and collected his troops there, hearing of the death of 'Am ul mulk, advanced towards Idar, sent an army to plunder Mahra, devastated Idar, p. 296, granted the request of the Rāja of Idar, returned to Kōdhrāh, bestowed the presents of the Rāja of Idar on 'Am ul mulk, sent Shāhzāda Sikandar khān to Muhammadābād as an acting governor, ordered Qasr khān to possess Dahūd as far as the village of Dōvla, p. 297, advanced towards Dhārāgarh, gave assurance of safety to Harkhūkhā, did not allow his *amīrs* to attack the kingdom of Sultān Mahmūd when the latter had gone to put down the *amīrs* of Chandōr, p. 298, proceeded to Dhār, visited the tombs of Shāikh, the destruction of Pūrabās by Nizām-ul mulk greatly annoyed him, marched towards Gujrāt, p. 299, appointed Nizām ul-mulk to recover the country of Idar and make it over to Bihār Mal, proceeded towards Ahmadnagar, went to Pattan leaving the title-holders to guard the camp, sent Bihār Mal with Nizām-ul-mulk, ordered Nizām ul-mulk not to prolong the war after recovering Idar, p. 300, celebration

of the marriage of Shāhzāda, advanced to visit Idar, after hearing of the murder of Zahir ul mulk by Rāj Mal sent *jurmān* to Malik Nusrat ul mulk to invade and devastate the country as far as Bijānagar, p. 301, representation from *darōgha* of Dahūd about the arrival of Sultān Mahmūd khān at precious gifts to and welcome of Sultān Mahmūd as a *hāfiz*, p. 302, advanced into Mālwa fought with the Rājput near Mandū, besieged Mandū, a message from Rāj Pithorā to the Sultān, p. 303, agreed to the request of Rāj Pithorā, victorious fight with the Rājputs of Mandū, general massacre in the fort of Mandū, p. 304, bestowed the fort of Mandū on Sultān Mahmūd, advanced to meet Rāmā Sānkā, accepted the invitation of Sultān Mahmūd and went to Mandū with the Shāhzādas, p. 305, visited the palaces and buildings of Mālwa, went back to Dhār, having 'Asat khān Gujrātī started for Gujrāt, advanced towards Idar to punish Rāj Māl and other disturbers, destroyed the territory of Rāj Māl, came back to Muhammadābād Chāmpānīr, p. 306, went to Idar for enjoyment, entrusted the government of Idar to Malik Mubārīz ul-mulk, p. 307, went to Chāmpānīr leaving Qiwām ul mulk at Ahmadābād for the control of *grāmys*, p. 308, after hearing of the ferocious activities of Rāmā Sānkā appointed 'Imād ul mulk and Qasr khān to crush him, p. 311, instructions to 'Imād ul mulk and Qasr khān in connection with their march towards Chitōr, wanted to march to Chitōr but postponed it at the advice of Malik Ayūz Sultānī, arrived at Ahmadnagar, p. 312, sent Malik

Ayaz and Qawam ul mulk to chastise Rana Sanka sent Taj Khan and Nizam ul mulk Sultan to reinforce the Gujrati army p 313 detailed accounts of the chastisement of Rana Sanka pp 313-316 advice of Malik Ayaz to Rana Sanka came to Ahmadabad to advance towards Chitor p 317 forgave the offences of Rana Sanka present of Rana Sanka to the Sultan spent some days in Jhalawar and went to Ahmadabad bidding farewell to the son of Rana Sanka went to Kapor bhanj grieved at the death of Malik Ayaz and conferred a *Jagir* on his eldest son rode out from Champanur to chastise some rebels p 318 halted between the towns of Mahrassa and Harsol rebuilt the fort of Mahrassa and returned towards Ahmadabad excessive sadness on the death of a member of his harem went to Champanur to refresh himself request of Alam Khan to the Sultan and p 319 its fulfilment went through Champanur to Idar delay in fulfilling the expectations of Shahzada Bahadur Khan p 320 going round his dependencies Shahzada Bahadur Khan went to vards Delhi arrival of Babar Badshah to conquer India fight of Bahadur Khan with the Mughals p 321 hearing of the arrival of Babar Badshah and departure of Shahzada Bahadur Khan became sorrowful ordered Khudawand Khan to summon Shahzada Bahadur Khan famine in Gujrat fell ill p 322 hearing of the division of the army enquired about the arrival of Shahzada Bahadur Khan called Sikandar Khan to his presence and

gave him some advice died period of reign p 33

Muzaffar Shah Habshu Sultan of Bangala how he ascended the throne p 441 (and see n 1 p 441) his nature how he was murdered period of reign p 442

N

Najm ul din Qaran Ghan Khwajah was entrusted with the duties of *ta'ir* by Humayun Shah was given the title of Malik ut tujjar p 77

Namat ul lah Khwajah was given the title of Saif Khan by Mahmud Khalji p 59

Namat ul lah Saiyid Shah Habib ul lah a great ancestor p 84

Namat ul lah Tabrizi Khwajah was sent by Bahadur to ask pardon of the latter's offences from Mahmud Shah p 121 wrote to Bahadur about the acceptance of his prayer by Mahmud Shah p 122 was sent by Bahadur with a petition to Mahmud Shah p 123 made a representation to Mahmud Shah p 124

Naqd ul mulk his flight p 577 was expelled by the *amirs* p 578

Narsingh Ray one of the associates of Ahmad Shah p 51 informed Ahmad Shah about the invasion of Sultan Hushang summoned Hushang to his aid when Ahmad Shah had besieged the fort of Kehrla agreed to pay Hushang his daily expenses p 5 paid tribute to Muhammad Shah Lashkari p 105

Nasib Shah Sultan of Bangala succeeded his father bestowed *jagirs* on the *amirs* of Afghan and on Sultan Mahmud prayed for the hand of the daughter of Sultan Ibrahim for himself sent beautiful presents to Sultan Bahadur of Gujrat p 444

- period of reign, p 415 (and *see* notes 1-2, p 145)
- Nasū, son of 'Ādil Khān, *see* 'Ādil Khān, ruler of Asū and Burhānpūr
- Nasīr, Sayyid, at the call of Sultān Hasan he was coming to help but died on the way near the valley of Pīr Punjāl, p 681
- Nāsir the slave, ruler of Bangāla, after the death of Sultān Ahmad sat on the throne, was put to death, period of reign, p 434 (and *see* note 5, p 434)
- Nasū Khān, (ruler of Asū), accepted the proposal of Ahmad Shāh for the marriage of Shāhzāda 'Alā-ud-dīn with his own daughter, p 15, raided a part of the territory of the Dakinī Kingdom, p 57, was opposed by Malik-ut-tujjār and went back to Asīr, his death, p 58, his possession of parts of Sultānpūr and Nadarbār, p 196, took possession of the fort of Tālnū, invaded the country of Sultānpūr, p 198, prepared to defend himself in the fort of Tālnīr, requested Ahmad Shāh to excuse his offences, was given the title of Nasīr Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p 199, gave shelter to Kānhā in his kingdom, p 213, joined Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, fled to the hills of Kaland, p 214
- Nasīr Khān, brother of Sultān Muzaḥḥar Gujrātī, was left in the fort of Dhār by Sultān Muzaḥḥar Gujrātī, his treatment of the *ra'īyats* and the attack of Mālwa army, p 469, different views about his name, p 469, n 4
- Nasīr Khān, son of Sikandar Khān, attacked Natū Khān, p 621, fought against Shujā 'Khān but was defeated and fled, p 622
- Nasīr Khān, Sultān of Gujrāt, Bahā'ul-mulk placed Nasīr Khān on the throne and gave him the title of Sultān Mahmūd, *amīrs* of Gujrāt offered congratulations, 'Imād-ul-mulk comforted the *amīrs*, p 328, arrival of Bahādur Shāh in Gujrāt and the defence of 'Imād-ul-mulk, pp 329-332, period of reign, p 333
- Nasīr Khān Jahān, son of Qādir Khān, on account of his cruel and high-handed actions, p 153, requested Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī to save his dominion from the attack of Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī, p 455, waited on Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī at Chandēri, p 456
- Nāsū Kiyānī, went to conquer Tibet, p 738
- Nasīr Rāja Malik, *see* Adil Khān, ruler of Asū and Burhānpur
- Nasīr Shāh, son of 'Abd-ul-qādir, news of his oppression reached Mahmūd Khālījī, p 511, submitted a representation to Mahmūd Khālījī and was pardoned by the latter, p 512, a message regarding his unorthodox views reached Mahmūd Khālījī, p 515, was expelled by Sultān Mahmūd Sharqī from Kālpī, his request to Mahmūd Khālījī, p 516, rendered homage to Mahmūd Khālījī, p 517, Rātah and Mahōbah were given to him by Mahmūd Sharqī, p 519
- Nāsir Shāh, Sultān of Bangāla, the *amīrs* placed one of the descendants of Sultān Shams-ud-dīn *Bhangara* on the throne and gave him the title of Nāsir Shāh, p 434, died, period of reign, p 435 (and *see* note 1, p 435)
- Nāsū-ud-dīn, this title was conferred on Ismā'il Fath by 'Alā-ud-dīn Hasan Bahmanī, p 8
- Nāsir-ud-dīn, Sultān, Sultān of Mālwa, took the kingdom from Sultān

Chiyath ud din on the a lance of Mahmud Shah he submitted to him p 281 was given the title of Nasir Shah by Sultan Chiyath ud din and appointed as the heir of the latter p 244 is puto with Shuja at Khan p 200 his birth p 223 gained favour with his father hostility of Shuja at Khan supported his father took all the affairs of the state in his own hands an evil deed of Rani Khurshid in literature p 24 with drew his hands from the duties of the emperor Rani Khurshid and Shuja at Khan took over the management of the affair of the government of Sultan Chiyath ud din an order of Sultan Chiyath ud din to seize the murderers of Munja Baqi p 222 a message of his father attended his father left his father and went towards Dhar p 226 sent a petition to his father order of Rani Khurshid for his destruction amazement of the army p 257 encamped in the town of Thahnah amirs of the Chiyath Shahi states joined him moved to the town of Rajawiyah raised the royal umbrella over his head p 228 sent Malik Malhu to chastise the troops of Shuja at Khan was reinforced by the amirs hearing of his strong position Chiyath ud din sent ambassadors to him his reply to Chiyath ud din p 222 his victories over the troops of Shahdabad p 260 failure of Shuja at Khan and Rani Khurshid in their evil attempt fight between Shuja at Khan and the effort of Sultan Chiyath ud din for peace p 261 his disputes with Shuja at Khan and their result p 262 sat on the throne of the empire made over Shuja at Khan and Rani Khurshid

to custodians appointed his heir his general announcement as the Sultan and punishment of the enemies was allowed to do homage to his father was recognized as Sultan by his father p 264 concentration of the enemies under Sher Khan hostility of Sher Khan p 265 aggression on the death of his father p 266 suppressed the disturbances caused by Sher Khan instigation of Shaikhji was prompted Sher Khan to rebellion which caused the latter's death p 267 imprisoned Shaikh Habibullah occupied himself with pleasure and drinking in example of his immorality erection of a palace in Bigh Fir p 269 built a lofty and noble palace in Nagar having chastised the rebels returned to his capital accepted tribute from the Zamindars of Chitor sent Iqbal Khan Khwajah Jahun to Akr and Burhanpur rebellion of Sultan Shihabuddin p 270 unfavourable reply of Sultan Shihabuddin to his father p 271 removed Sultan Shihabuddin and made Iqbal Humayun his heir various diseases attacked him his counsels and precepts to the amirs and Mahmud Shah p 272 his death and period of reign p 273

Nasir ud din Abd ul qadir Sultan
see Nasir ud din Sultan Sultan of Malwa

Nasir ud din Abd ul daula was directed to command the force by Ahmad Shah p 200

Nasir ud din Arab Sayid was sent by Ahmad Shah to Karbala to open out a stream was insulted by Sher Malik p 43

Nasir ud din Dabir Malik his treachery with Mahmud Khalji p 498 was pardoned by Mahmud Khalji

- was given the title of Nasrat Khān and a fief by Mahmūd Khālji, his rebellion against Mahmūd Khālji, p 499, was relieved of the government of Chandēri, p 501
- Nasir-ud-dīn Muhammad Dāūdī, Shaikh, p 37
- Nasrat Chak, opinion of Ghazī Khān, p 729, his imprisonment, p 731, his release, went to Khān Khōnān Bahrām Khān, p 736
- Nasrat Khān, his plans against Husain Khān, p. 741, his imprisonment, p 742, was blinded, p. 744
- Nasrat Khān, brother of Muzaffar Shāh, was placed in charge of the government of Mālwa by Muzaffar Shāh, p 186, his harsh treatment of the *ra'iyats*, rebellion against him, was rescued by *Khwājahdār* and was sent to Gujrāt, p 187
- Nasrat Khān, son of Iqbāl Khān, went to bring Shihāb-ud-dīn, p 580
- Nasrat-ul-mulk, Malik, was left in the service of Ā'zam Humāyūn by Mahmūd Shāh, p 285; was sent to Idar, was ordered by Muzaffar Shāh to devastate as far as Bijānagar, p 301, advanced to give battle to Rāy Mal, p 306, was brought to Ahmadābād by Muzaffar Shāh, p 307, was slain, p 327
- Nasr-ul-lah Dabir, *Khwājah*, representation of other *amīrs* through his intervention to Sultān Hūshang, p 484
- Nasr-ul-lah Parniyānī, *Khwājah*, in concert with other *amīrs* brought Shāhzāda Mas'ūd Khān and placed him on the throne of Mālwa, p 494
- Natū Khān, was appointed to the Sarkār of Hāndiyah, p 621
- Naurūz Aswad, son of Ahmad Aswad, was made the chamberlain of Sultān Hasan, p 676
- Naurūz Chak, his house was burnt, p 716
- Naushīrwān, the just, p 82
- Nazirī, the poet, friend, and companion of Amīrzāda Habib ul-lah, p 85
- Nazir, Shāh, his statement about the death of Mirzā Haidar, p 717
- Nazr Be Uzbek, was ordered to support Burhān, joined Burhān, p 158
- Nāzūk Chak, his escape from Ghazī Khān, p 730, his rebellion, p 731, his execution, p 732
- Nāzūk Shāh, Sultān of Kashmīr, the Kashmīris brought the family of Mirzā Haidar to Srīnagar and divided the country of Kashmīr among themselves, his accession, p 719, an amicable settlement between Ghazī Khān and Sankar Chak, groups which exercised power in Kashmīr, p 720, power of the Chaks, the Mākris went to Bānkāl, p 721; release of the Mughals, skirmishes between the Chaks and the Mughals, p 722, victory of the Kashmīris over the Niyāzī tribe, p 723, hostilities among the Kashmīris, p 724, period of rule for the second time, p 725
- Nāzūk Shāh, son of Fath Shāh, Sultān of Kashmīr, was given the title of Sultān by Abdāl Mākri, p 697, accession, capital, his *vazīr*, division of the country, p 698, allotment of divisions, summoned Muhammad Shāh, accession of Muhammad Shāh for the fourth time, was appointed successor of Muhammad Shāh, period of reign, p 699, Malik Abdāl defeated Malik Kājī, Mirzā Kāmran sent detachments for the conquest of Kashmīr, p 700, destruction of the Kashmīris by the Mughals, retreat of the Mughals, Malik Kājī retired to Hindūstān,

- Sultan Sayyid Khan of Kashghar conquered Kashmir and destroyed the Kashmiris p 701 fight between the Kashgharis and the Kashmiris resulted after a great loss in peace p 703 agreement with the Kashgharis famine in Kashmir p 704 illness of Muhammad Shah and his death p 705
- Nazuk Shah son of Sultan Shams ud din succeeded his father but was defeated by Mirza Haidar p 707
- Nekruz father of Karshashab p 633
- Nizam Khan reinforced Dastur Khan and attacked Hushang p 581
- Nizam Mufarrah bore the title of Ashti Khan was the governor of Gujrat under Sultan Mahammad his cruelty p 173 received a letter from Zafar Khan p 175 reply to Zafar Khan his advance to fight with Zafar Khan his murder p 176
- Nizam Shah son of Humayun Shah succeeded his father administration was entrusted to the hands of Makhduma i-Jahan p 86 marched out with his *amirs* for the campaign the army of Nizam Shah fell upon the vanguard of the Rays of Orissa defeated them and made them return to their capital p 87 advanced to meet the army of Mandu placed ten thousand horsemen in charge of Khawajah Mahmud Gilani made over the army of the centre to Khawajah Jahan Malik Shah Turk p 88 defeated the army of Sultan Mahmud came with Malkah i Jahan to Firuzabad p 89 wrote a letter to Sultan Mahmud of Gujrat sent Khawajah Jahan with a large army to fight against Sultan Mahmud Khalji p 90 advanced to fight with Mahmud Khalji asked help from Sultan Mahmud of Gujrat offered him thanks for his help and died period of his reign pp 92 243 244 and 245
- Nizam Shah nephew of Chaznun Khan was blinded by Chaznun Khan p 49^o
- Nizam ud din Jam son of Salah ud din ruler of Sind a count of his government p 775
- Nizam ud din Jam i.e. Jam Nanda ruler of Sind accession on the throne of Sind account of his reign p 778
- Nizam ud din Shaikh went to Champaur from the side of Sultan Mahmud Khalji for drawing up the treaty p 23^o
- Nizam ud din Ahmad the author the statement which he had heard from the friends of Shuja Khan p 626 his statement about the tree of Kashmir p 717 his statement about the rulers of Sind p 771 his statement about the Sultan of Multan p 800 his final statement p 811
- Nizam ud din Dehlavi Shaikh issued a general invitation for dinner during the reign of Sultan Tughlaq Shah Hasan Gangu presented himself before him told Hasan Gangu symbolically that he will become a Sultan p 8
- Nizam ul mulk Malik of Gujrat p 192 was sent to Badr Ala in order to assure the latter's safety by Ahmad Shah was seized by Badr Ala was released by the people of Ahmad Shah p 193 was sent to punish Malik Shah p 195 Ahmad Shah made him the regent of his kingdom during his absence and ordered him to punish the Raja of Mandal p 199 was sent to hunt in the neighbourhood of Dlawara was defeated by the *Parabia* Rajputs p 200 was appointed to recover the country of Idar made over Idar to Bihar Mal

- fought with Rāy Mal, p 300, his illness, was summoned to the presence of Muzaffar Shāh, left Zahir-ul-mulk at Idar and hastened towards Muhammadābād, p 301, was appointed to attack Muhāfir Khān by Sultān Bahādur, p 335
- Nizām ul mulk Malik, was appointed *vazīr* by Sultān Shihāb ud-dīn, p 110, made an agreement with the Turkī amīrs, his fruitful flattery of Qiyām-ul mulk p 111, after the death of Qiyām-ul mulk took up the duties of *vazīr*, was wounded by Dilāwar Khān p 112, informed Malik Barīd about the hostile intention of Dilāwar Khān and started for Junīr p 113
- Nizām ul mulk Malik father of Malik Badeh was sent to the *thāna* at Kiz by Mahmūd Shāh, p 263, requested Mahmūd Shāh to confer the *thāna* which, belonged to him, on his son and to take him with him for the performance of the *Haq*, was advised by Imād-ul-mulk to go alone for pilgrimage on behalf of all, was greatly liked by Mahmūd Shāh, was sent to the *amīns* to demand a reply to the Sultān's question, p 269
- Nizām-ul mulk father of Malik ut-tujār, governor of Junīr, pp 74, 75
- Nizām ul mulk son of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, informed Malik Barīd about the ambition of Sultān 'Alā ud dīn, p 133
- Nizām ul mulk Bahī a slave of Brahman was called Bahrī, his son Ahmad had the ambition to rule, *vazīrs* of Sultān Kalīm ul-lah made Nizām ul-mulk Bahī a prisoner and put him to death, p 136
- Nizām ul-mulk Bahrī, ruler of Ahmad-nagar, his death, p 391
- Nizām ul mulk Bahrī ruler of Kāwīl, helped Malik Hīsām ud dīn Maghūl in placing Khānzāda 'Ālam Khān on the throne of Asir and Burhānpūr, p 283, leaving horsemen with 'Ālam Khān and Malik Hīsām-ud dīn went to Kāwīl, p 284, stationed near the border of Asir with 'Ālam Khān with his army, p 287, presented a petition to Mahmūd Shāh, p 288
- Nizām ul mulk Dakinī, joined Sultān Bahādur and was given the title of Muhammad Shāh by him, p 355
- Nizām ul mulk Ghūrī, Humāyūn Shāh sent him to the country of Tilang, went away from the foot of the fort of Tilang p 79, fled and joined Sultān Mahmūd Khaljī, p 80, instigated Mahmūd Khaljī to invade the Deccan, pp 87, 533
- Nizām-ul-mulk Sultānī, was sent by Muzaffar Shāh to join Malik Ayāz, p 313, was sent with an army to Na'icha, p 590
- Nizām-ul mulk Turk, Malik, father of 'Ādil Khan and Daryā Khān, appointed to take charge of the left wing of the army of Nizām Shāh, pp 88, 535, was given Junū by Muhammad Shāh Lashkarī as *jāgīr*, p 94, was appointed to conquer the fort of Kehila, pp 95, 536, attacked the Mandū army, on a petition of mercy excused the Mandū army, p 95, was made martyr by a Mandū soldier, p 96
- Nizām-ul Mulkiya, list of Sultāns, p 7
- Nūh bin Yūsuf-ul-mulk was given the title of Shams ul-mulk by Sultān Bahādur, p 333
- Nūr, Malik, son of Malik Ahmad, Husam was entrusted to him by Sultān Hasan, p 680
- Nūr Bakhs, Sayid Muhammad, sent a gift to Mahmūd Khaljī, p 539
- Nūr Qutb 'Ālam, Shaikh, p 443

Nur ud din Shahkhi was respected by
Mahmud Khalji p 539

P

Pandey Brij was the vazir of Raja
Bhoj after accepting Islam he was
known as Shahkhi Abd ul lah Jangal
p 99

Pandus p 633

Pars Ram Raja Bakar entered the
service of Sultan Bahadur p 348

Parasram Raja of Jammu took part
in the murder of Saiyid Hasan p
682 was sent back with gifts
p 686

Payinda Khan Afghan was permitted
to go back to Jaunpur p 330

Piyara Malik was appointed by Ram
Khurshid and was given the title of
Al Khan p 562 joined Sher Khan
p 65

Pirah Isma il his title p 538 his
execution p 24 and see Kabir
Sultan M 11.

Pir Khan fought against Maqbul Khan
p 537

Pir Muhammad Khan was sent to
conquer Malwa by Akbar p 631

Pir Muhammad Khan Mirza possessed
Multan seized Sarang Khan p 180

Pishrau Khan had an interview with
Murtada Nizam Shah conveyed the
order of Khalifa ilah to Murtada
Nizam Shah went back with the
tribute presented by Murtada Nizam
Shah p 148

Pitoria Ray was appointed by Medini
Ray to guard the fort of Mandu
sent a message to Muzaffar Shah
pp 303 590 60.

Prthu Raj was given half of the
territory of Bakar by Sultan
Bahadur p 349

Punja an army was sent by Ahmad
Shah to attack him p 509 his
attack his submission to Ahmad

Shah which was not accepted p 210
his death p 211

Puran Mal son of Silhad possessed the
fort of Raisin and its neighbourhood
p 617

Q

Qadam Khan with the title of Sultan
Ala ud din son of Sultan Mahmud
Khalji was given the command of
the amirs of Chanderi p 503 was
entrusted with the government of
the forts of Harauti and Rantam
bhor p 506 captured the fort of
Bundi p 503 favours conferred on
him by Sultan Ghiyath ud din
p 543

Qadan Qadi surrendered the fort of
Bhakkar to Shah Beg p 778

Qadi Khan fought against Maqbul
Khan p 537

Qadir Khan ruler of Kalpi p 481

Qadr Khan his fight with Malik
Muqarrab Ahmad Ayaz p 214

Qaiser Khan was summoned by Mah
mud Shah was sent with Imad ul
mulk by Mahmud Shah for the
conquest of Jalor and Sajor was
murdered by Mujahid Khan p 270

Qaisar Khan inkstand bearer of Sultan
Hushang informed Ahmad Gujrati
of the plan of Mahmud Khalji
p 503

Qaisar Khan thanadar of Sultan Mu
zaffar Gujrat was sent by Mu affar
Shah to Dahud 594 was ordered
by Muzaffar Shah to take possess on
of the country as far as Devla p 297
Muzaffar Shah sent presents through
him to Sultan Mahmud p 30 was
appointed to crush Rana Sanka by
Muzaffar Shah taking Qawam ul
mulk went to Parantej p 311 was
appointed to punish the rebels by
Sultan Sikandar p 306 sent a
message to Latf Khan to leave
Champanur 336 sent a number of

- retainers with Shūjā'-ul-mulk, p. 339, was imprisoned by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p. 340, welcomed Sultān Mahmūd and treated him with great respect, p. 601
- Qarrā Bahādur Mīrzā, was appointed the governor of Bahaimal, created disturbance against the Mughals, p. 714, sent a message to Mīrzā Haidar, was imprisoned by the Kashmūīs, p. 715, his release, p. 722, his fight with Ghazī Khān, p. 737
- Qāsim, Khwājah, was slain, p. 716
- Qāsim, Malik, was summoned by Mahmūd Khālji, p. 502
- Qāsim, Mīrzā, son of Khwājah Hājī, accompanied Yūsuf Khān, p. 761
- Qāsim, Mulla, little Tibet was given to him by Mīrzā Haidar, p. 712
- Qāsim, Shāh, teacher of Mir Shams, p. 689
- Qāsim, Saiyid, was left behind to collect tribute in Karnāl, p. 196, was sent with Shāhzāda Muhammad Khān by Ahmad Shāh, p. 213
- Qāsim Husain Sultān, was appointed to the government of Bahrōj by Humāyūn Bādshāh, could not stand the attacks of Gujātīs, went to Tardī Bēg Khān, p. 377
- Qassāb, the name of an elephant, under whose feet Shīr Malik was thrown by the order of Ahmad Shāh, p. 43
- Qawām Khān, *see* Yūsuf Qawām, Malik
- Qawām Khān Lankāh, joined Mīrzā Shāh Husain, p. 806
- Qawām-ul-mulk, son of Qawām-ul-mulk, was sent to encourage the citizens of Dhār by Muzaffar Shāh, inflamed the desire of Muzaffar Shāh to visit Dhār, p. 298, fought with great exertion and slew many Rājputs, p. 303, was left in Ahmadābād to control the *grāssias*, p. 308
- Qawām-ul-mulk, Malik, was sent to the town of Kodhrā by Mahmūd Shāh, p. 263, crushed the Rājputs, p. 275, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to punish Bahādur Gilānī, p. 279, was sent by Muzaffar Shāh to attack Rānā Sānkā, p. 304, went to Parāntēj, p. 311, was sent to join Malik Ayāz, p. 313, penetrated into the hills of Bānswāla and caused great destruction, p. 314, opposed Malik Ayāz in making peace with Rānā Sānkā, p. 316, enslaved the *fīrangīs*, p. 344, was sent by Muzaffar Gujrātī to welcome Mahmūd Shāh, p. 601, was sent by Muzaffar Gujrātī to punish Mēdinī Rāy and Rānā Sānkā, p. 602
- Qiwām-ul-mulk, was appointed to attack Bahādur Gilānī by Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 117
- Qiyā Khān, was sent to conquer Mālwa by Akbar, p. 631
- Qiyām-ul-mulk Turk, Malik, was appointed *vazīr* by Sultān Shihāb-ud-dīn, p. 110, agreed to the proposal of Malik Nizām-ul-mulk, p. 111; was killed by the Turkī *amīrs*, p. 112
- Qulī Khān, Shāh, was appointed to invade Kashmīr, p. 760
- Qulī Qutb-ul-mulk Hamadānī, Sultān, of the Quyun tribe and a *vazīr* of the Bahmanīs, p. 167, he sold himself to Sultān Mahmūd, he took possession of Gōlkonda, period of his reign, p. 168
- Qutb, officer-in-charge of the island of Mahām, p. 214, informed Sultān Ahmad about the tyranny and oppression of Malik Hasan, p. 215
- Qutb 'Ālam Shaikh Fa'id-ud-dīn Mas'ūd Shakarganj, was sent to wait on Mahmūd Khālji by Ghāzī Khān, p. 533-34
- Qutb Khān, joined Sultān Bahādur, p. 348, was sent by Sultān Muhammad

to fight against Mahmud Khalji p 10

Qutb ud-din Sultan son of Sultan Shams ud din Sultan of Kashmir accession character sent Lohar for the conquest of the fort of Loharkot p 64 execution of Ray Rawal and imprisonment of Hasan period of reign p 643

Qutb ud din Ahmad Shah Sultan Gujrati succeeded his father received the title of Sultan Qutb ud din Ahmad Shah currency of the rite of Nishtar bestowed jagirs upon the amirs p 26

Sultan Mahmud Khalji advanced into the country of Gujrat consultation with a baqal advice of the baqal amirs took him along to carry on the war with Sultan Mahmud gained victory p 27 met Sultan Mahmud in Kaparbanj Malik Ala ud din Suhrah joined him p 28 communication with Sultan Mahmud by a couplet returned to Ahmadabad with triumph p 29

Shams Khan went to Ahmadabad conferred favours on Shams Khan and married his daughter in the nikah form sent reinforcements to Nagor devastation of the men of Nagor by Rana Kumbha p 230 advanced against the fort of Kumbhalim Gita D orah did homage appointed Malik Shaban Sultan in charge of the fort of Abu sent a messenger to a minn Imad ul mulk advanced to capture the fort of Sirohi defeated the Raja of Sirohi invaded the country of Rana Kumbha p 231 Kumbha offered tribute returned to Ahmadabad peace and settlement with Sultan Mahmud Khalji p 23 marched to invade Kumbhalim took the fortress of Abu delivered it to

Gita D orah from Abu advanced towards Kumbhalim Rana Kumbha retired to the fort of Chitor Rana being defeated begged for pardon returned to Ahmadabad p 233 resolved to punish the Zamin dars marched to Sirohi destroyed various towns sent armies to ravage the dominions of Rana Kumbha giving up the siege of the fort of Kumbhalim advanced towards the fortress of Chitor to help Sultan Mahmud plundering the surrounded country went to Ahmadabad forgave Rana Kumbha at his request his illness interview with Sayid Muhammad p 234 prophecy of Sayid Muhammad date of death title after death period of reign special characteristics amirs put Shams Khan to death p 235

Qutb ud-din Tank 1 Sultan of Multan sent a message to Shaikh Yusuf gave his daughter in marriage to Yusuf p 789 defeated Shaikh Yusuf and ascended on the throne of Multan sent Shaikh Yusuf to Delhi p 790 raised the standard of sovereignty period of rule p 791

Qutb ud din Muhammad Khan Chiznavi Burhan Nizam ul mulk came to him was one of the amirs of Khalifa Ilahi p 157

Qutb ud din Shaibani Malik his treachery towards Mahmud Khalji p 498 was killed by Mahmud Khalji p 499

Qutb ul Mulkiya list of the Sultans see p 7

Qutlagh Khan brother of Alam ul mulk p 8

R

Rabe a Bibi wife of Haidar Khan her fight and death p 73

Rādī-ul-mulk, *see* Almad, Sultān of Gujrāt

Rādī-ul-mulk, *amīr* of Sultān Muzaḥfar, his efforts to transfer the rule of Gujrāt from Sultān Bahādur to Chānd Khān, p 610

Rafī'ul-mulk, was given the title of 'Imād-ul-mulk by Sultān Bahādur and was made '*Ārid-i-Mumālīk*, p 335

Rāja of Ābū, looted a caravan of merchants, received a *farmān* from Mahmūd Shāh, gave back what he had looted to the merchants and sent a tribute to Mahmūd Shāh, p 278

Rāja of Badhūl, p 194, his petition to Sultān Hūshang, p 195

Rāja of Chāmpānī, sent a representation to Sultān Hūshang, p 197, did homage to Ahmad Shāh, p 199, his submission to Ahmad Shāh, p 201

Rāja of Gwāhar, his nephew entered the service of Sultān Bahādur, p 346

Rāja of Idar, his rebellion, sent his *vakīls*, p 177, to Zafar Khān, p 178, agreed to pay tribute to Zafar Khān, p 180, evacuated the fort, p 181, his rebellion, fought against 'Am-ul-mulk, became victorious, evacuated the fort of Mahrāsa, fled to the hills of Bījānagar, p 296, asked Muzaḥfar Shāh to pardon him, sent a message to Muzaḥfar Shāh, was excused by Muzaḥfar Shāh, p 297

Rāja of Kālā, sent tribute to 'Ādil Khān, p 289

Rāja of Karnāl, gave shelter to Shāh Malik, his fight with Almad Shāh, his defeat, fled to the hills of Karnāl, asked pardon for his offences, p 196

Rāja of Māhūr, joined Mirān Muhammad Shāh, p 402

Rāja of Māl, did not favour Latif Khān, p 337

Rāja of Mandal, p 194, instigated Sultān Hūshang to conquer Gujrāt, p 195, brought Sultān Hūshang to Gujrāt, p 197, his rebellion, p 199

Rāja of Mandargarh, his fight with Zafar Khān, his defeat, promise for the payment of a tribute, p 179

Rāja of Nādōt, p 194, his petition to Sultān Hūshang, p 195, brought Sultān Hūshang into Gujrāt, p 197, asked pardon of his offences, p 199

Rāja of Suōhī, fought with Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn and was defeated, p 231, fled to the hills, p 234

Rāja of Sōrath, his negligence in the payment of a tribute, p 197

Rāja Rustam, Nizām-ul-mulk, was sent to Jālā by the Dakinī *vazīrs*, his treatment of the Saiyyads, p 65, became afflicted with leprosy, p 66

Rām, governor of Kākrūn, on the advance of Muhammad Khān he evacuated Kākrūn and fled, p 368

Rām Chand Nāik, Rāy, was sent by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn to reinforce Nāgōr, p 230

Rām Rāj of Bījānagar, was attacked by Husam Nizām-ul-mulk, advanced to meet Husam Nizām-ul-mulk, p 141, was killed, p 143

Rām Shāh, Rāja of Gwāhar, helped Mubārak Khān Saiwānī, p 622

Rānā Kūmbhā, his determination to recover Nāgōr from Mujāhid Khān, marched against Nāgōr, sent a message to Shams Khān to carry out his promise, on the denial of Shams Khān advanced towards Nāgōr, fought and destroyed the men of Nāgōr, p 230, his fight with Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 231, after defeat paid tribute to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 232, left Kūmbhalmīr and retired to the fort of Chitōr, fought and was crushed by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn,

made submission to Sultan Qutb ud din attempted to destroy Nagor hearing of the preparations of Sultan Qutb ud din withdrew his steps p 233 was besieged by Sultan Qutb ud din in the fort of Kum bhalmir prayed Sultan Qutb ud din for the pardon of his offences p 234

Rana Sanka p 299 helped Ray Mal took possession of the country of Idar from Bihar Mal and made it over to Ray Mal p 300 news of his arrival in the neighbourhood of Ujjain to aid and reinforce Medini Ray p 304 treated Sultan Mahmud with kindness and sent him to Mandu turned towards Idar p 307 ravaged Idar to the boundary of Sirohi came to Bakar and then to Dungarpur p 308 advanced against Idar advanced against Ahmad nagar a battle with Mubarez ul mulk p 309 ravaged Ahmadnagar advanced to Besalnagar and ravaged it p 310 went to help the *Uanadar* of Mandisor p 314 sent a message to Malik Ayaz sent a message to Silhadi p 315 sent emissaries to Malik Ayaz p 316 a message from Malik Ayaz p 317 sent his son with tribute to Muzaffar Shah his offences were excused by Muzaffar Shah p 318 paid tribute to Shahzada Bahadur when he arrived at Chitor p 321 his son rendered homage to Taj Khan p 343 hearing of the defeat of Ray Pithora went back with Medini Ray and Silhadi to his own country p 604 advanced towards Kakrum defeated Mahmud Shah p 606 his kind treatment of Mahmud Shah p 607 seized a part of the kingdom of Mahmud Shah p 608

Raṣṣan Raja son of Raja Sirdev his *vazir* his successor p 634

Rani Raja of Idar was summoned by Firuz Khan to help him p 192 fled to the hills of Idar his treachery towards Firuz Khan p 194 brought Sultan Hushang into Gujrat p 197 asked pardon for his offences and did homage to Ahmad Shah p 199

Ran Mal Raja of Tibet reinforced Habib Khan p 758

Rashid ul mulk Malik was given the title of *Khudawand Khan* by Muzaffar Shah p 293

Ratan Sen son of Rana Sanka prayed Sultan Bahadur for the pardon of Jagas offences p 349 devastated the villages of Sipla and Balavat confronted Sultan Mahmud at Ujjain p 350 waited on Sultan Bahadur at the pass of Karch obtained leave to go to Chitor p 351 advanced into Malwa p 610 made complaints about Mahmud Shah to Sultan Bahadur p 611

Rawal Ray his execution p 643

Ray of Bijanagar seized the fort of Badhul and made martyrs of Musalmans p 15 hearing of the advance of Sultan Muhammad fled and took shelter in a fort p 16 posted himself on the other side of the river Krishna to confront Firuz Shah p 30 was killed by Qazi Siraj p 31 plundered certain *parganas* of Ala ud din p 67 feeling himself unable to withstand Ala ud din asked pardon for his offences and gained safety p 69

Ray of Gwalior paid tribute to Sultan Husain p 460

Ray of Mahaur marriage of his daughter p 219

Ray of Mahur rose in rebellion was defeated by Sultan Ahmad Shah became a loyal adherent of Ahmad Shah p 47

Rāy of Orissa, defeated Khawāja Jahān and Nizām-ul-mulk Ghūrī, p 79, came to ravage Bidar, p 86, plundered and devastated a portion of the Deccan, p 102, took the fort of Bakīr, p 105, made his submission to Sultān Husam, p 460

Rāy of Rāhal, submitted, after fighting and killing the brother and son of Dilāwar Khān, sent his daughter with a large tribute to Dilāwar Khān, p 67

Rāy of Sangēsar, sent a large tribute with his daughter to Dilāwar Khān and promised loyalty, p 67

Rāy of Sonkar (Sangēsar), p 97

Rāy Bābū, Rāja of Baklāna, his son paid tribute to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p 527

Rāy Singh, Rāja of Māl, p 341, sacked the town of Dahūd, p 342, suffered great loss from the invasion of Tāj Khān, p 343

Rāyān, Rāy, son of Mēdinī Rāy, his reply to Khudāwand Khān in connection with the conspiracy against Mahmūd Shāh, swore before 'Imād-ul-mulk on the *Qurān* and achieved his agreement to the conspiracy, p 265, communicated the message of the support of 'Imād-ul-mulk to Khudāwand Khān, p 265, determination of the Rājputs to place him on the throne, p 597

Rāymal Chitōrī, his relation with Bhawānidās, p 570

Rāyzāda of Kehrla, was defeated by Tāj Khān and Ahmad Khān, p. 540

Rēgī Chak, sent a petition to Hamāyūn, p 707, joined Mīrzā Haidar, took charge of the affairs of Srinagar, p 708, his fight by the side of Mīrzā Haidar, suspicions of Mīrzā Haidar about him, joined Kājī Chak, p 709, his flight, his fight and death, p 710.

Rukn Khān, see Ibrāhīm Nizām, Sayyid.

Rukn-ud-dīn, his flight with his brother Hīsām-ud-dīn to Mālwa, p 241

Rukn-ud-dīn, Shaikh, through his intercession the rebels Bahrām Khān and Govind Rāy were pardoned by Sultān Muhammad Shāh, p 17

Rūmī Khān, fired the bastions of the fort of Rāīsīn, p 360, his direction of the war, p 372, joined with Khān Jahān Shīrāzī and marched towards Bahrōj, p 377

Rūpmatī, wife of Bāz Bahādur, p 631

Rustam Khān, brother-in-law of Chengīz Khān, p 398, his flight with the corpse of Chengīz Khān, p 409

Rustam Khān, governor of Sārangpūr, paid tribute to Nāsir-ud-dīn, p 559

S

Sa'adat Khān, united with Fīrūz Khān, p 189

Sa'adat Sultānī, Malik, defended the fort of Tambōl, fell upon the Dakinī army and slew many of them, attacked and defeated the Dakinī army, p 218, was favoured by Ahmad Shāh, p 219

Sa'ad Khān Lūdī, news of his encampment reached Mahmūd Shāh, p. 592, sent a message to Bihjat Khān, p 593

Sabr 'Alī, Rājaurī was made over to him by Mīrzā Haidar, p 712, joined Mīrzā Haidar, burnt down the edifices of Sultān Zam-ul-'ābidīn, p 716, his release, p. 722, was slain, p 723.

Sa'd Bakht, Malik, was made Burhān ul-mulk by Mahmūd Shāh, p 242

Sādāt Khān, joined Sultān Ahmad, p 395, was sent to occupy Bahdar by Shēr Khān, p 410, joined Shēr Khān, p 412

Sadhā, Malik, attacked certain villages in Chāmpānīr, fought with the Rāja

- of Champanir and attained martyrdom p 7-
- Sadhu the *thanadar* of the fort of Shahr (Sa_hir) helped Fizuz Khan in his attempt p 27
- Sadiq Khan was sent to conquer Malwa by Akbar p 631
- Şadiq Muhammad Khan was sent with Burhan to attack the Afghans p 157
- Sadr Jahan came to Champanir to draft the treaty on behalf of Sultan Mahmud Khan p 23
- Şadr Jahan Mahdum Ā zam p 15 (and see n 1 p 1-5)
- Sadr Jahan Sharf ul Ulama p 124
- Şadr Khan took a message to Mahmud Shah p 577 joined Şahib Khan p 583 fled towards Chanderi p 592 decided to pay tribute to Mahmud Shah p 594
- Şadr Khan governor of Raisin advised Sultan Bahadur not to raise the siege of Chitor p 371 encouraged Sultan Bahadur p 372 was taken in the service of Humayun Badshah p 375
- Şadr ud din Qadi went as an ambassador to Ali Shah p 750
- Sa d ul lah Lahori Maulana his description of the siege of the fort of Multan p 807 description about himself after the victory of Husam Mirza p 808
- Şafdar Khan devastated the country of the Rays of Kokan plundered the country of Rahal p 67 was sent by Mahmud Shah to help Ā am Humayun p 288 was wounded in the battle between Rana Sanka and Mubariz ul mulk p 309 retired to Ahmadabad 310 was sent by Muzaffar Shah to chastise the Rajputs of Lakshkot after ravaging Lakshkot rejoined Malik Ayaz p 313 heard about the plan of
- Udaya Singh fought and defeated Udaya Singh p 314
- Şafdar Khan Sultan Malik was sent by Ahmad Shah to guard the camp faced the enemies and defeated them p 208
- Şafdar ul mulk p 9
- Şahib Khan cousin of Mujahid Khan assisted Mujahid Khan in the murder of Qasr Khan p 70 ran away with his family p 271
- Şahib Khan Shahzada (son of Sultan Nasir ud din) was placed on the throne of Mahmud Shah by Muhafiz Khan with the title of Sultan Mahmud p 589 summoned Şadr Khan and Afzal Khan his rise p 583 his flight from Shahr p 584 received a wound in the battlefield a message from Mahmud Shah p 585 his defeat and flight interview with Ladgar Mughul went to the village of Lorgaon p 586 was attacked by Lodha and sought shelter with the ruler of Kawil p 587 sent an army to conquer Sarangpur p 593 his grief on the death of Muhafiz Khan p 594 agreed to the proposal of submission to Mahmud Shah and received favours from the latter p 595 after hearing of the treacherous plan of Bihjat Khan betook himself to Sultan Sikanlar's army pp 595 96
- Şahrah Ray see Qutb ud din Lankah Sultan of Multan
- Sahum his literary work and qualifications p 658
- Said Malik was brought by Ain ul mulk to the presence of Mahmud Shah Dakini was given the title of Bahadur Malik by Mahmud Shah p 1-6
- Said ul mulk Malik was sent to Badr Ala by Sultan Ahmad Shah was seized by Badr Ala p 193 investigated the news of the welfare

- of Shāhzāda Ahmad Khān and reported to Mahmūd Shāh, p 267.
- Saifī, fought with the Saiyids, p 684, obtained release and fought against Muhammad Shāh p 688, Fath Shāh's regard for him, his rank, p 689, his execution, p 693
- Saif Khān, with the help of other *amīrs* placed Shāhzāda Hasan Khān on the throne, p 75, was executed by the order of Humāyūn Khān, p 76
- Saif Khān Dēhlavī, his representation to Qādir Shāh, p 618, his advice to Qādir Shāh, p 619
- Saif Khwājah, was sent to Badr 'Alā by Sultān Ahmad Shāh, p 193
- Saif-ud-dīn, was ordered by Sultān Bahādur to be hanged, p 335
- Saif-ud-dīn, Malik, Superintendent of the elephants, was sent with presents to Sultān Shams-ud-dīn by Firūz Shāh, p 424
- Saif-ud-dīn, Malik, was given the command of the fort of Ranthambhōr by Mahmūd Khālji, p 520
- Saif-ul-mulk, advised I'tmād to leave Ahmadābād, p 404, arrival at Ahmadābād, p 407
- Saiyid Khān was sent by Sultān Muhammad to fight against Mahmūd Khālji, p 510
- Saiyid Khān, Sultān of Kāshghar, sent an army to invade Kashmīr, p 701
- Saiyid Khān of the Niyāzī tribe, advanced to conquer Kashmīr but was slain, p 723
- Saiyid Mirzā, his flight to Dābil, p 715
- Saiyid Sultān, was slain by Ghazī Khān, p 533
- Sajāwal Khān, *see* Shujā' Khān, Sultān of Mālwa
- Salābat Khān, original, his rank in the service of Murtada Nizām Shāh, envy of the *amīrs*, fight, victory, p 148, imprisonment, entrance into the fortress, p. 149, reply to the men in charge of the fort, p 150 (and *see* note 4, p 149)
- Ṣalāh-ud dīn, Jām ruler of Sind, account of his government, p 775
- Ṣalāh-ud dīn, Jām relative of Jām Firūz hostility with Jām Firūz, p 779, received reinforcements from Sultān Muzaffar Gujrātī, his death, p 780
- Sālār Hamza, Mashīr-ul-mulk, was sent to Jālma by the Dakinī *vazīrs*, his treatment of the Saiyyads, p 65, became afflicted with leprosy, p 66
- Sālbāhan, refused to accept the terms of Mahmūd Shāh, p 598, was killed by the servant of Mahmūd Shāh, p 599
- Salīm, Sultān, 'Alī Shāh sent the daughter of his nephew to him, p 750
- Sāmat Rāy, Rāja of Dandwāna, was killed by the soldiers of Sultān Hūshang, pp 206, 479
- Sanbal Khān, was sent to help Jām Firūz, p 780
- Sān Dēvī, mother of Yūsuf Khān, p 683
- Sanjai, Jām, ruler of Sind, account of his rule, p 778
- Sanjār Khān, joined Bihjat Khān, p 588
- Sankar, was given a part of Kashmīr and was made the revenue officer by Fath Shāh, p 690, as the revenue minister of Fath Shāh, p 692, his imprisonment, death, p 693
- Sankar Chak, son of Kājī Chak, envy (which he bore) to Ghāzī Khān, refused the summons of Daulat Chak and Ghāzī Khān, p 720; created disturbances, p 733, his revolt, p 741
- Sarandīp, Malik, plunder of the gifts sent by him to Hajjāj, p 762
- Sarang, p 697, fought against Nāzūk Shāh and was slain, p 698

Sarang Khan was seized by Mirza Pir M hammad Khan p 180

Sarka Raja his fort was captured by the Malik ut tujjar was imprisoned p 61 was pardoned and made the pioneer of his army deceived Malik ut tujjar and led them to the mouth of death p 62

Sev Das Baqal was killed by Sultan Chiyath ud din p 555

Sarwar Malik entered the service of Bahadur Shah p 331 was given the title of Khwajah Jahan by M hammad Shah was granted the title of Sultan ush sharq by Mahmud Sultan and later appointed to the government of Jaunpur by him p 447

Sha ban Imad ul mulk Malik the conspirators resolved to remove him from his office p 338 inference of Mahmud Shah from his behaviour his imprisonment order of Mahmud Shah to bring him the denial of guards to leave him without the permission of Add ul mulk p 239 was appointed by Mahmud Shah to drive away flies p 240 made an attack on the conspirators p 241 separated himself from the office of the tazarat p 242

Sha ban Sultani M l k was entitled Imad ul mulk was appointed in charge of the fort of Abu by Sultan Qutb ud din commenced a battle was summoned by Sultan Qutb ud din p 31

Shadi Khan, Purabiya was sent by Ray Pithora to put down Imad ul mulk p 604

Shahab ud din was the son of Malik Sha ban Imad ul mulk p 38

Shahbaz Khan Afghan advanced to conquer Kashm p 73

Shah Beg Arghun ruler of Sind, conquered the fort of Sewi possessed

the fort of Blakkar p 778 seized the fort of Sihwan p 779 possession of Thatha p 780 gained the rule of Sind p 781 his literary ability and bravery p 78

Shah Malik Malik rose in revolt p 194 his flight from the battlefield a sudden attack on the camp of Shahzada Latif Khan p 195

Shah Mir see Shams ud din Sultan of Kashmir

Shah Mirza joined Chengiz Khan p 403

Shah Rukh Mirza was appointed to invade Kashmir p 760

Shahdad Mir arrived in Multan p 803

Shah Beg Arghun helped Jam Firuz p 180

Shah Beg Uzbek his fight with Amir Dhualnun Beg p 781

Shah Khan was made *locum tenens* of Ali Shah p 600 retired to Sialkot p 651 joined Jasrat defeated Ali Shah entered Kashmir as Sultan p 652

Shah Malik was sent by Gha n Khan to seize Zafar Minjumla p 487

Shah ha Malik was reinforced by Qadi Pir Ishaq p 280

Shah han Qadi came from the Deccan to Mahmud Khan for peace p 538

Sham Mir his arrival in Kashmir p 689

Sh m Chak helped Lohar his imprisonment p 757 fled from prison and joined Haidar Chak p 758 his offences were pardoned by Yusuf Khan p 759

Sham Dubar his advice to Khan Zaman, p 743

Sham Dubi his determination about Yusuf Khan p 60

Sh m Khan son of Firuz Khan, for fear of Mujahud Khan fled to Rana

- Kūmbhā, p 229, agreed to fulfil the conditions of Rānā Kūmbhā, took possession of the fort of Nāgōr, consulted with the *amīrs* in connection with the fulfilment of the demands of Rānā Kūmbhā, refused to fulfil his promise, went to Ahmadābād to seek for help, was favoured by Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 230, was put to death by the *amīrs* of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 235
- Shams Khān Dandānī, ruler of Nāgōr, was appointed to the office of *vazīr* by Tātār Khān, p 183, was favoured by Ā'zam Humāyūn, p 181
- Shams Mughal, Khawājah, was sent as an ambassador to Islām Khān, p 714
- Shams Zīnā, his imprisonment, p 725, joined Ghāzī Khān, p 726
- Shamshēr-ul-mulk, was appointed to seize 'Add-ul-mulk by Sultān Bahādur, p 335
- Shams-ud-dīn, Khawājah, was left in Multān, p 810
- Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān, ascended the throne of Dakin, p 25, Shāhzādas Firūz Khān and Ahmad Khān attempted to regain their hereditary dominion, their success, p 26, period of reign, p 27
- Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Bangāla, p 429, succeeded his father, how he passed his life, period of reign, p 430 (and see note 3, p 429)
- Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmīr, his ancestry, p 633, acquired power, message of Kōpā Dēvī, became the ruler of Kashmīr, p 635, accession, suppression of tyranny, rebuilt the kingdom of Kashmīr, p 636, meted out punishment to the Lūn tribe, left all affairs to Jamshīd and 'Alī Shēr, period of reign, p 637.
- Shams-ud-dīn, Sultān, son of Sultān Muhammad Shāh, Sultān of Kash-
- mīr, accession, disputes between Malik Kājī and Abdāl Mākī, p 706, was succeeded by his son Nāzuk Shāh, p 707
- Shams-ud-dīn Shāh, Darvīsh, p 255
- Shams-ud-dīn Tārmī, Malik, came to see Mahmūd Shāh, p 122
- Sharf-i Jahān, was sent by Mahmūd Shāh to Alf Khān to reassure him of his safety, p 279
- Sharf-i-Jahān, physician of Sultān Muhammad Lashkarī, p 109
- Sharf-ul-mulk, p 313
- Sharf-ul-mulk, Malik, was ordered by Mahmūd Shāh to bring Sha'bān to the *darbār*, guards did not allow him to take Sha'bān, p 239
- Sharq, Malik, advised I'tmād Khān to leave Ahmadābād, p 404
- Sharqī Sultāns, list of the rulers, p 417
- Sharzah Khān, son of Bihjat Khān, was sent to attend on Mahmūd Shāh, p 584, was sent by his father to welcome Shaikh Aūhiyā, p 595, joined Sultān Bahādur, p 612
- Sharzah Khān Shaiwānī, came with a message from Sultān Mahmūd to Malik Ayāz, p 315
- Sharzat-ul-mulk, fled from the fort of Mandū, p 352
- Shēr, was executed, p 660.
- Shēr Āshāmak, was conferred on powers by his brother, p 639
- Shēr Khān, asked Malik Mujāhid-ul-mulk for protection, went away to Kāwil, p 289
- Shēr Khān, father of Salīm Khān, Bangāla came under his possession after Nasīb Shāh, slew Jahāngīr Qulī Bēg, p 445
- Shēr Khān, son of Muzaffar Khān, ruler of Chandēri, chastised Sultān Bahlūl Lūdī, pp 546-47, his advance towards Chandēri, p 565, made over Mubārak Khān and 'Ālam Khān to his men,

turned to give battle to Nasir ud din p 566 his flight a letter from Shaikhzadas of Chanderi and his advance p 567 his struggle and death p 568

Sher Khan son of Sultan Muzaffar united Firuz Khan p 189

Sher Khan Afghan received Darya Khan with favour p 388 sent a farman to Qadir Shah p 617 his successful advance towards Malwa submission of Qadir Shah p 619 gave the Sarkar of Lakhnauti to Qadir Shah his direction to Shuja at Khan p 60 hemistich composed by him on the flight of Qadir Shah gave the towns of Ujjain and Sarang pur to Shuja Khan and also the government of Malwa p 61

Sher Khan Fuladi the district of Pattan as far as Kari came into his possession p 398 arrived at Ahmadabad and offered his congratulations to Sultan Muzaffar p 399 defeated Iltmad Khan p 400 sent a letter to Chengiz Khan p 401 Usmanpur Khanpur and Kalupur came into his possession p 405 sent Sadat Khan who possessed Bahdar vacated Bahdar at the arrival of Sultan Muzaffar p 410 agreed with the views of Iltmad Khan for suppressing the Mirzas p 411 went to Saiyid Hamid Bukhari to enquire about the truth of the fact about which Iltmad Khan had written to him on the arrival of Khalifa Iltmu became exhausted and fled p 413

Shirwan Khan killed Burhan p 391

Shevadas father of Bhawan das p 510

Shihab ud din Sultan brother of Sultan Husan his rebellion and imprisonment p 193

Shihab ud din Sultan son of Sultan Nasir ud din Sultan of Malwa see Miyan Majhla

Shihab ud din Sultan son of Sultan Shams ud din Sultan of Kashmir accession character and qualifications p 610 marched as far as Ashtnagar and slew his enemies submission of the Raja of Nagarkot residence p 611 his heir banished his sons founded two cities period of reign p 61

Shihab ud din Mahmud Shah son of Muhammad Shah Lashkar succeeded his father p 109 appointed Malik Qiyam ul mulk Turk and Malik p 110 Nizam ul mull as his vassals p 111 Dilawar Khan Habshi took permission for killing the vassals p 112 owing to the desertment of all the amirs irregularities and weakness crept in his affairs Malik Barid kept him in imprisonment became weak and the men of the city attacked him p 113 a body of ungrateful persons attacked him Aziz Khan Turk Hasan Ali Khan and Saiyid Mirza Mahhadi fought against the rebels and saved him p 114 ordered Jahangir Khan to guard the gate and Khan Jahan to guard the city and bazar troops dispersed the rebel and destroyed them Adil Khan sent a representation about the rebellion in his territory p 115 ordered the amirs to march to the help of Adil Khan to put down the rebels and himself also started arrived in the vicinity of Rajmundry fought and defeated the rebels seized Dastur ul mulk but pardoned his offences and confirmed his rank returned to Gulbarga marched towards the fort of Sunkar besieged the fort and captured it leaving one of his

trusted men there, returned to Bidar, defined the ranks of great and noble men, p 116, hearing of the rebellion and oppression of Bahādur Gilānī he sent a *farmān* to Bahādur in which he asked him to stop his oppression and to send back everything to the court of Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī and to release Kamāl Khān and Safdar Khān, Bahādur sent him an improper reply, p 119, advanced to punish Bahādur, arrived in front of the fort which was in the possession of Bahādur seeing the grandeur of his army Bahādur fled, arranged the affairs of the place, arrived at Bōrkāl Bahādur took to flight from Bōrkāl, the Rāys or Zamīndārs enlisted themselves as the loyal adherents of Mahmūd Shāh, the commander of the army of Bahādur posted himself in the fort of Mirich, his *amīrs* taking him advanced to capture Mirich, fought with the men of Bahādur, p 120, commandant of the fort of Mirich prayed for peace, making peace with the men of Bahādur occupied the fort of Mirich, turned towards the forts of Kalhar and Dābul, birth of his son at Mālwa, gave the name Ahmad Shāh to his son, Bahādur asked pardon of his offences, p 121, Bahādur was excused and was asked to render homage and to pay tribute, Bahādur did not pay any attention to the order, advanced towards the fort of Jākīr, fight in the town of Kalhar, advanced towards Kālāpūr, p 122, received the news of the preparations of Bahādur for war at Salāla, arrived in the vicinity of Kolāpūr, most of the troops of Bahādur separated from him, Bahādur took to the path of his flight, sent Malik

Fakhr ul-mulk and Ain ul mulk to take charge of the fort of Panāla, spent the rainy season in Kolāpūr, Bahādur demanded, p 123, assurance of his safety and promised to remain loyal in his service, agreed to the request of Bahādur, sent learned men to assure Bahādur but his resolution changed again, p 124, sent Malik Fakhr-ul mulk to crush Bahādur, Fakhr ul-mulk met with the army of Bahādur, fought bravely and became victorious, p 125, conferred favours and the title of Khwājah Jahān on Malik Fakhr-ul mulk, entered the fort of Panāla sent Malik 'Ain ul-mulk to occupy the island of Goa and to take possession of everything belonging to Bahādur, properties of Bahādur were entrusted to 'Ain-ul-mulk, returned towards the capital, halted in the town of Bijāpūr, p 126, showed favours to the ambassadors of Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī, granted double the normal remuneration to the ambassadors, sent presents to Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī, sent for all the adherents of Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī and granted favours to them, ordered for making over twenty ships to the servants of Sultān Mahmūd Gujrātī which were taken by Bahādur, p 127, returned from camp and took up his residence, p 129, in Bidar, *sardārs* went to their places, became powerless, p 130 Malik Barīd rose to power, made him into a puppet, informed 'Imād-ul-mulk who asked him to come to Kāwīl, fled to Kāwīl, was welcomed by 'Imād-ul mulk, arrived in the city of Bidar with the soldiers of 'Imād-ul-mulk to crush Malik Barīd, p 131, joined the army of Malik Barīd, complaint about the slave

of Imad ul mulk Imad ul mulk returned to Kawi his miserable life death period of reign p 132 purchased ʿAbdī Khān from Khawajah Mahmud Garjstani p 159 marched from Bidar to destroy Bahadur Gilani p 279

Shiraz ul mulk his petition to Mahmud Khālji p 336

Shir Malik insulted Saiyyad Nasir ud din Ahmad Shah sentenced him to death p 43 (and see n 1 p 3)

Shutab Khan guardian of the seraglio p 84

Shuja Khan Sultan of Malwa was entrusted with the government of Malwa by Shēr Khan appointment of Haji Khan Sultan and Natu Khan p 61 fought a victorious battle with Nasir Khan p 62 a letter from Haji Khan Sultan advanced to reinforce Haji Khan defeated Mallu Khan brought the whole of Malwa into his possession attitude of Islam Khan towards him p 623 misdeeds of Uthman Khan and the punishment which he suffered became aggrieved at Islam Khan's actions p 624 was attacked and wounded by Uthman Khan sent a message to Islam Khan p 625 sent Fath Khan to collect tribute and bid farewell to Islam Khan p 626 departed from Islam Khan and arrived at Sarangpur his declaration in connection with fighting against Islam Khan went away in the direction of Banwalah Islam Khan took possession of Malwa without causing any damage came and rendered homage to Islam Khan was given presents by Islam Khan gave *jagirs* to Daulat Khan Ajiyala and Malik Mustafā and Miran Bayazid his death period of reign p 628

Shuja at Khan had the title of Sultan Ala ud din dispute with Sultan Nasir ud din and his flight p 55 he with all his sons was beheaded p 53 hostility with his brother p 54 took the affairs of the kingdom in his hands p 55 sent an army in pursuit of Shaikh Habib and Khawajah Suhail p 57 sent a report to Chivath ud din about the power of Nasir ud din p 59 his fight with Nasir ud din p 61 his fight with Nasir Shah and its result p 66 was seized by the *amirs* of Nasir Shah p 63 was made over to custodians p 64 was ordered by Sher Khan to watch on Qadir Shah p 619

Shuja ul mulk joined Latif Khan p 339

Shuja ul mulk Bukhari Shailh took the administration of Sultan Husam in his hand p 806

Sikandar Sultan of Gujrat succeeded his father buried the body of his father in the town of Sarkhej p 373 arrived in the town of Batuli and visited the tombs of the holy men ill treatment of the servants of Muzaaffar Shah p 34 soldiers and *rajjals* became annoyed on the unjustified bestowal of favours people tried to bring Shahzada Bahadur Khan knowing the avicious intention of Shahzada Latif Khan appointed Sharzah Khan to put him down Malik Latif Khan in pursuit of Latif Khan met with the Raja of Chitor and was slain in a battle p 325 appointed Qasim Khan for the punishment of the Rajputs of Chitor determination of Imad ul mulk to dethrone him attempt of Imad ul mulk to murder the Sultan did not believe reports against Imad ul mulk news of the

- advance of Bahādur Shāh caused him great mental worry, saw in a dream, p 326, a number of Shaikhs and Muzaffar Shāh, entrance of 'Imād-ul-mulk into the palace, 'Imād-ul-mulk met Nasiat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm, Nasiat-ul-mulk and Ibrāhīm were slain, p 327, one of the companions of 'Imād-ul-mulk made a martyr of the Sultān, period of reign, p 328
- Sikandar, Sultān, son of Bahlūl, a petition from Jām Bāyazīd, his *farmān* to Daulat Khān Lūdī, p 802
- Sikandar, Sultān, son of Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, Sultān of Kashmīr, accession, p 644, sent Rāy Mādārī to Tibet, defeat of rebels, relation of friendship with Amīr Tīmūr, p 645, Islāmic religion in Kashmīr, showed honour to Sayyid Muhammad, p 647, made arrangements for breaking images and pulling down the temples, p 648, bestowal of title and kingdom, period of reign, p 649
- Sikandar Khān, incited Mahmūd Khālji to seize the fort of Māhūr p 526, exhibited Shēr Khān's body on the gallows, p 568
- Sikandar Khān, governor of Satwās, went to his *Jāgīr*, his rebellion, p 587, sought pardon of his offences, p 589, rose in revolt for the second time, p 591, returned victorious to Satwās, p 592, brought Satwās with its neighbourhood into his possession, p 608, was made over to jailors by Shēr Khān, p 620
- Sikandar Khān, son of Sultān Sayyid Khān, was sent to invade Kashmīr, p 701, fought with the Kashmīrīs, p 703
- Sikandar Khān Bukhārī, p 69, invited Sultān Mahmūd Khālji to invade Berār, p 70, joined Mahmūd Khālji, besieged Māhūr, after the arrival of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn took the path of flight, met 'Alā-ud-dīn on the way and asked pardon of his offences, p 71, raised a rebellion, went to Mālkonda, defeated Khān Jahān, p 77, was defeated by Humāyūn Shāh, p 78, had to run away to Bīdar taking Nizām Shāh with him, p 243
- Sikandar Khān Satwāī, waited on Sultān Bahādur and was received with favour, p 350
- Sikandar Khān, Shāhzāda, was sent by Muzaffar Shāh to act as the governor of Muhammadābād, p 297, heard the precious advice of Muzaffar Shāh, p 323
- Sikandar Lūdī, Sultān, son of Bahlūl Lūdī, sent gifts to Mahmūd Shāh, p 289, sat on the throne of Delhī after the death of Bahlūl Lūdī, defeated Bārbak Shāh, p 462, pursued Bārbak Shāh, possessed Jaunpūr, defeated Sultān Husain and seized his territory, p 463
- Sikandar Shāh, Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded his father by the exertion of the *amīrs* with the title of Sikandar Shāh, p 424, proclaimed the gospel of justice p 425, occupied himself with the duties of the *Saltanat*, sent a tribute to Sultān Firūz Shāh, being aware of the advance of Firūz Shāh fortified himself in the fort of Ekdāla but in the end paid tribute and asked pardon of Firūz Shāh, passed his life in pleasure, p 426, period of reign, p 427 (and see note 2 of p 426)
- Sikandar Shāh, Sultān of Bangāla, p 436, the *amīrs* placed him on the throne, his work as the Sultān (n 3, p 436), period of reign, p 437

Sikar son of Sultan Qutb ud din p 643
 Silhadi went to Chitor to bring Rana

Sanka to the aid of Rav Pithora
 p 602 occupied the boundry of
 Sarangpur as far as Bhilsa and
 Raisin p 608 end of his power
 and submission to Mahmud Shah
 p 609 was summoned by Mahmud
 Shah to his aid p 610 Mahmud
 Shah granted some *parganas* to him
 made complaints about Mahmud
 Shah to Sultan Bahadur p 611
 his death p 616 Also see Silhadi
 Purabia

Silhadi Purabia came with Sultan
 Mahmud to Mandisor message of
 Rana Sanka to him p 315 being
 aware of the intention of Sultan
 Mahmud sought protection of Ratan
 Sen went to Chitor p 350 waited
 on Sultan Bahadur at the pass of
 Karchi p 351 left Bhupat at
 Ujjain and waited on Sultan Baha
 dur p 356 news of his arrest
 p 357 sent a message to Sultan
 Bahadur expressing the wish to
 accept Islam p 360 advised Sultan
 Bahadur to postpone the matter of
 conquering the fort of Raisin which
 was accepted went to the fort and
 inflamed the feeling of Rajputs
 against Sultan Bahadur p 361
 hearing of the death of his son
 fainted and was arrested p 362
 fought with the Dakini army p 367

Sima Imad ul mulk Sultan p 324
 Siraj made Srinagar over to Ali Sher
 p 639

Siraj Qadi killed Ray of Bijanagar
 p 30

Siraj Khan received the title of
 Muazzam Khan treated Hasan
 Khan and Habib ul lah with cour
 tesy took them into the citadel
 and attacked them put Amirzada
 Habib ul lah with his friends to

death p 83 was afflicted with
 leprosy p 84

Siraj ul mulk his son opposed Nizam
 ul mulk Turk but fled after a fight
 p 536

Sirdev Raja p 63 his descendants
 p 634 sent tribute to Dilju p 637

Sirkaja Ray paid tribute to Mahmud
 Khalji p 536

Siyah Bhat his oppression death
 p 650

Sri Bhat his request to Sultan Zam
 ul abidin p 653

Sufi Khan son of Ala ul mull was
 summoned by Mahmud Khalji
 p 50

Suhail Khwajah was allotted the
 management of *Khalsa parganas*
 p 554 killed Munja Baqal and fled
 p 555 fled from the palace of
 Nasir ud din p 556 waited on
 Nasir ud din p 557 was nominated
 to crush Yakan Khan p 560 was
 sent by Nasir Shah to conquer the
 fort of Mandu p 563 favoured
 by Nasir ud din p 564 took the
 wounded Sher Khan and fled p 568

Suhrab Duda Malik joined Sultan
 Husain grant to Malik Suhrab by
 Sultan Husain p 795

Suhrab Sultan Malik was sent by
 Zafar Khan to surround the country
 of Thana p 215

Sikh took a message to Habib
 Chak was punished by Habib Chak
 p 728

Sulaiman Malik son of Malik Sher ul
 mulk Ghuri was declared to be the
 ruler of Chanderi by the *amirs*
 fight with Mahmud Khalji p 506
 death p 50

Sulaiman Kararani his supremacy
 over Bangala and Behar p 445 and
 Orissa assumed the title of *Hadrat*
Ala after his death his son suc
 ceeded him p 446

Sultānī Malik Mī, was appointed by Ahmad Shāh to collect Khīrāj, p 221, through his intervention Ganēsā did homage to Sultān Muhammad Shāh, had the title of Khān Jahān p 224
 Sultāns of Bangāla, list of p 418 (and *see* note 4 on p 415)
 Sultāns of Gujrāt list of, pp 172-73
 Sultāns of Mālwa list of, p 465
 Sultāns of Multān list of, pp 787-88
 Sultān Muhammad, his qualifications, was respected by Zain-ul-‘ābidīn, p 656
 Sultān-us-Salātīn, Sultān of Bangāla, succeeded his father, his qualities, death, period of reign, p 429 (and *see* note 2 on p 429)
 Sultān-ush Shaiq Shaiqī Sultān, rise to sovereignty, extension of power, p 447, death, period of reign p 448
 Sūrā, was sent by Rāy Batāī to Sultān Ghiyāth-ud dīn Khālījī to ask for help, p 273
 Sūrajmal, was sentenced to death, p 562
 Syām Dās, Rāy, Rāja of Dūngarpūr, paid tribute to Mahmūd Khālījī, p 533

T

Taghālījī imprisoned and blinded Sultān Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, placed Sultān Shams-ud-dīn on the throne of Ghiyāth-ud-dīn, p 25
 Taghī, revolted in the neighbourhood of Nahrwāla Pattan, took possession of that place, besieged the fort of Bahrōj, p 9, Sultān Muhammad contemplated his subjugation, p 10
 Tāhn, Mīr, was sent to the fort by Mīrzā Khān, p 153
 Tāhūr, Mīrzā, went as an ambassador to Yūsuf Khān, p 758
 Tāhūr, Sayyid, p 84
 Tāhūr, Shāh came from Sultāniya to the, p 137, Deccan, became a courtier of Burhān Shāh, adopted Imāmīa religion, p 138 (and *see* n 4, p 137), was respected by Sultān Bahādur of Gujrāt, p 139
 Tāhūr Āl, father of Shāh Mīr, p 633
 Tahmāsp, p 162, was blinded by his brother ‘Alī ‘Ādil Khān, p 163
 Tahmāsp, Shāh, p 148
 Tamūr Gūrgān, Amīr, his arrival in the neighbourhood of Delhi, p 180, his oppression, p 181
 Tīmūr, Amīr, his friendship with Sultān Sikandar p 645
 Tāj Bhat, Malik, was sent to attack Bahrām Khān p 677
 Tāj Jamāl, Malik, was sent by Bahādur Shāh with a *farmān*, p 331
 Tāj Khān, was sent by Sultān Mahmūd Khālījī with a message of peace to Sultān Qutb-ud-dīn, p 232, was sent to meet Rāy Batāī by Mahmūd Shāh, p 272, was sent by Muzaffar Shāh to join Malik Ayāz, p 313, advanced with a well-equipped army, p 329, to join Bahādur Shāh, p 331, saw Bahādur Shāh, p 332, was left on the bank of the river Bātrak by Bahādur Shāh, p 334, was sent by Sultān Bahādur to attack ‘Imād-ul-mulk, p 335, informed Sultān Bahādur about the hostility of Ulugh Khān and Qaisar Khān, p 340, undertook the task of chastising Rāy Singh, p. 342, devastated the country of Māl, p 343, was sent by Muzaffar Gujrātī to welcome Mahmūd Shah, p 601, climbed the hill on which the fort of the enemy was built, p 603
 Tāj-ud-dīn, Malik, Ahmad Shāh conferred on him the title of Mu‘īn-ul-mulk and directed him to remain at Tālnīr, p 219, was sent to Delhi by Sultān Shams-ud-dīn with a tribute, p 423

Tamachi Jam ruler of Sind account of his government p 774

Tamm Ansari p 772

Tardi Beg Khan was entrusted with the charge of guarding the treasure by Humayun Badshah p 376 was appointed governor of Champanir p 377 relinquished the country of Gujrat p 378 went to Agra p 379

Tatar Khan Sultan of Gujrat *ia ir* of Sultan Muhammad Shah p 175 came from Delhi to Gujrat owing to the violence of Mallu Khan his request to his father plundered the country of the Raja of Idar p 180 requested his father to help him in defeating Mallu Khan reply of his father p 18 accession to the throne assumption of the title of Sultan Muhammad Shah bestowal of wealth and honour conferred the office of the *ia ir* on Shams Khan Dandani words of his monogram march from Asawal to conquer Delhi p 183 ravaged the villages and towns of Nadot halted in the town of Sanur period of his reign title of Muhammad Shah after his death after grieving for the death of Muhammad Shah Aam Humayun made Malik Jalal Kokhar over to Shams Khan Dandani and again sat on the throne rumor of the latter having poisoned Muhammad Shah p 184

Tatar Khan of Malwa was ordered to bring Na'iruddin to Chyathuddin advanced towards Barah p 557

Tatar Khan governor of the Punjab sent his army to aid the Saiyids p 685

Tatar Khan son of Sarang Khan joined Sultan Ibrahim p 451

Tatar Khan son of Sultan Ala'uddin was favoured by Sultan Bahadur

p 369 seized Biana fought with Mirza Hindal's army and was slain p 371

Tatar Khan Ghurn helped Imad ul mulk in devastating the house of Iltimad Khan p 396

Tatar Khan Lodi reinforced Barbal Shah p 793

Tawalak Imad ul mulk his address to Sultan Husain p 97 his rank in the time of Sultan Firuz p 798 caused the murder of Sultan Firuz p 799 his imprisonment p 800

Tufal Khan was defeated by the minister of Murtada Nizam Shah p 146 helped Miran Muhammad Shah p 40

Tughan Malik was made Farhat ul mulk by Mahmud Shah p 94 was appointed as the *thanadar* of Beyt by Mahmud Shah and left there p 61 was sent to the *thana* at fort Beyt and Jagat by Mahmud Shah p 63 arrived at the house of Imad ul mulk p 965

Tughlaq Jam ruler of Sind account of his government p 777

Tughlaq Khan informed Mahmud Shah about the preparations of the men of Karnal p 49

Tughlaq Shah Fuladi Malik brought the *amirs* back from the way p 316

U

Udai Singh received Shahzada Bahadur with good wishes p 391 joined the service of Bahadur Shah p 330

Udaya Singh Raja of Mal was defeated by Malik Ashja ul mulk and Safdar Khan p 314

Udu Mulla was respected and favoured by Sultan Zain ul abidin p 657

Ugar Sen Purabia was wounded in the battle between Ulaya Singh and Safdar Khan went to Rana Sankar

and related the story of the fight, p. 314

Ujh Bahrām, son of Mas'ūd Chak, his proposals for peace with Khān Mīrak Mīrzā, was killed by the latter, p. 710

Ulugh Khān, did not abandon his hostile attitude, p. 339, was sent by Bahādur Shāh against Latīf Khān, was imprisoned by the order of Sultān Bahādur, p. 340, was posted to Bhīlpūr by Sultān Bahādur, p. 353

Ulugh Khān, advised I'tmād Khān to leave Ahmadābād, p. 404, took Sultān Muzaffar to Dūngarpūr and made him over to I'tmād Khān, p. 406, became annoyed with I'tmād Khān came to Chengīz Khān, disapproved any idea of superiority among the servants of Sultān Mahmūd, heard of the intentions of Chengīz Khān in connection with his death, p. 407, went to the palace of Chengīz Khān, p. 408, invited I'tmād Khān to Ahmadābād, p. 409, proposed to possess Bahrōj, p. 410, resolved to put down I'tmād Khān, p. 411, hostility with Jhuhār Khān, went to Shēr Khān and informed him of the arrival of Sultān Muzaffar, p. 412, enlisted his name in the band of the loyal servants, p. 413

Ulugh Khān, brother of Mallū Khān, was blinded by Ibrāhīm 'Adil Khān, p. 162

Ulugh Khān Habshī, attacked Burhān, p. 391, attacked Saiyid Mubārak, p. 395

'Umar Khān, joined Sultān Bahādur and was highly honoured, p. 348

'Umar Khān, Shāhzāda, son of Sultān Hūshang, took to the path of flight, p. 495, was made the leader of rebels, p. 503, his attempt for

conquering Sārangpūr proved fatal, p. 505

'Uthmān Khān, the punishment for his improper actions, complained to Islām Khān against Shujā' Khān, p. 624, attacked and wounded Shujā' Khān, was put to death, p. 625

'Uthmān Khān, Shāhzāda, his treatment of his younger brother, p. 481, was pardoned by Sultān Hūshang, was summoned and made over to custodians by the order of Sultān Hūshang, p. 482

'Uthmān Jalāl, Malik, sent *sandārs* to wait on Mahmūd Khān, p. 485, his representation to Mahmūd Khān in favour of Shāhzāda 'Uthmān Khān, p. 486

W

Wajih-ul-mulk, father of Zafar Khān, p. 173

Walī-ul lah, was imprisoned in the cage of sovereignty by Malik Barīd; being led by an evil passion Malik Barīd poisoned him, period of his reign, p. 134

Y

Yādgār Bēg Qazlbāsh came as an ambassador from Irān with presents to the court of Mahmūd Shāh, p. 290, could not see Mahmūd Shāh alive, p. 291, his arrival in the neighbourhood of Muhammadābād, was welcomed by Muzaffar Shāh, p. 293, his house was looted, p. 295

Yādgār Mughul *Surkh Kulāh*, interview with Šāhīb Khān, death of his retainers, p. 586

Yādgār Nāsir Mīrzā, was sent with Mīrzā 'Askarī, p. 376, was appointed to the government of Pattan Gujrāt by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 377, relinquished Gujrāt, p. 378, was left in Gujrāt by Humāyūn Bādshāh, p. 616

- Yahya Khan the *Actual* of Humayun Shah seized him and put him to death p 82
- Yakan Khan was allotted the man ge ment of the *Khalsa parganas* p 554 was sent to seize the murderers of Munja Baqal p 550 sent a message to Nasir ud din p 556 his fight against Nasir ud din p 560 was sentenced to death p 564
- Yaqub son of Baba Ali his arrival at Kashmir p 746
- Yaqub son of Yusuf Chak went to the court of Akbar his letter to Yusuf p 759
- Yaqub son of Yusuf Khan was sent to Kashmir p 756 was made the commander of an army p 759
- Yaqub Chak his fief was confiscated p 757
- Yaqub Kashmiri Shah went to wait on Akbar p 758
- Yaqub Mir took the heads of Niyazis to Islam Khan p 73
- Yaqub Sayyid was seized by Idi Zina p 721 fled from custody and joined Daulat Chak p 792
- Yaqut bore the title of Khudawand Khan his fight his rank of service p 153
- Yari Malik brother of Malik Kaji seized Iskandar Khan and sent him to Muhammad Shah p 695 fought against Nazuk Shah and was slain p 698
- Yari Bhat Malik was sent in the direction of Delhi by Malik Ahmad p 679 defeated Tatar Khan devastated Sialkot enmity with Malik Ahmad p 680 his imprisonment p 681 was sent to ravage the place of shelter of Fath Khan p 687
- Yasir Afghan went as an ambassador to Mirza Haidar p 714
- Yehayyi Zina marriage of his daughter p 741
- Yusuf bin Abbasi *Mustanjad Billah* brought a mandate from Egypt conferring imperial rule upon Mahmud Khalji p 537
- Yusuf son of Ali Khan went to his father p 747 executed Ibrahim Khan p 750 was punished p 758
- Yusuf Malik was given the title of Saif Khan by Mahmud Shah and was sent in attendance on Azam Humayun p 285 entered the service of Bahadur Shah p 331
- Yusuf Mulla gave the order for the execution of Yusuf p 745 Yusuf executed p 746
- Yusuf Shah joined Sultan Ahmad was conferred the title of Azam Humayun p 395
- Yusuf Shah Sultan of Multan his election as the ruler of Multan his administration message of Ray Sahrah took the daughter of Ray Sahrah in marriage p 789 message from Ray Sahrah deceitful victory of Ray Sahrah over him period of reign p 790
- Yusuf Adil Khan founder of the dynasty what he was took possession of Sholapur p 159 also Bijapur period of his reign p 160
- Yusuf Andaz wounded Qadi Habib p 745
- Yusuf Chak his share in the division of Kashmir p 719 joined Daulat Chak with an army p 741 defeated the Niyazis p 743 fell from his horse p 726
- Yusuf Kashmiri joined Yusuf Khan p 756 his fief was taken from him p 757
- Yusuf Khan was sent to fight against Mubarak Khan by Mahmud Khalji p 527

Yūsuf Khān, son of 'Alī Shāh, Sultān of Kashmīr, message to Abdāl Khān, p 752, attacked Abdāl Khān, buried 'Alī Shāh and succeeded the latter, advanced against the rebels, p 753, came to Hīrahpur and Saiyid Mubārak Khān sat on the seat of authority, an attempt on Kashmīr, went to the village of Barsāl, message from Saiyid Mubārak Khān, p 754, intention of the Kashmīris to raise Lōhar Chak on the throne, p 755, went to Saiyid Yūsuf Khān Lāhōrī, sent Ya'qūb to Kashmīr, the government of Kashmīr was confirmed on Lōhar, started to conquer Kashmīr, took possession of Rājaurī, p 756, entered the fort of Sūyypūr, fought with Lōhar Chak, marched to Srīnagar, rebels were cast into prison, divided the country of Kashmīr, blinded Lōhar, imprisonment on suspicion, p 757, welcomed the ambassadors of Akbar, visit to Lār, p 758, sent an army to attack Haidar Chak, returned victorious towards Srīnagar, defeat of Haidar Chak, p 759, determination of his enemies about his son, advance of the army of Akbar towards Kashmīr, p 760, took up his station in the village of Nagar, made his submission to Akbar, p 761

Yūsuf Khān, son of Bahām Khān, was slain, p 683

Yūsuf Khān, Saiyid, Yūsuf Khān had an interview with him, p 756

Yūsuf Khān Hindaunī, waited on Sultān Mahmūd, p 509, his dispute was changed into friendship with Dāūd Khān by Mahmūd Khālji, p 526

Yūsuf Khān Lāhōrī, Saiyid, Yūsuf Khān had an interview with him, p 756

Yūsuf Qawām, Malīk, took part in the conspiracy against Mahmūd Khālji, was given the title of Qawām Khān and the fief of Bhilsā by Mahmūd Khālji, p 499, fled from the camp of Ā'zam Humāyūn, p 500, from Bhilsā, p 501

Yūsuf Shāh, Sultān of Bangāla, the *amīr*s placed him on the throne, died, period of reign, p 436 (and see note 2, p 436)

Yūsuf Turk, Malīk, joined the associates of Amīrzāda Muhibb-ud-dīn Habīb-ul-lah, passed through the gates of the citadel, p 81, cut off the head of the chief guard, released Amīrzāda Habīb-ul-lah, the sons of the Sultān, and Jalāl Khān Bukhārī, p 82

Yūsuf Zaī p 628

Z

Zabardast Khān, son of Hazbar Khān, with his help the Mālpūr gatekeeper was slain, p 563

Zafar Khān, (Gujrātī), p 184, sat on the throne in the town of Bīrpūr, assumed the title of Sultān Muzaffar Shāh, how he was described in the Khutba, distributed wealth and conferred honours, successive marches to the country of Mālwa, fought with Sultān Hūshang in the neighbourhood of Dhār and defeated him, p 185, put Sultān Hūshang with his adherents into prison, installed Nasrat Khān in the government of Mālwa, Sultān Ibrāhīm Sharqī came with the idea of seizing Delhī but owing to the opposition of Muzaffar Shāh gave it up, and went back to Jaunpūr, came back to Gujrāt, took Sultān Hūshang with him in captivity, rebellion of *ra'iyats* and soldiers of Mālwa, p. 186, against Nasrat Shāh,

Khwajahdar rescued Naṣrat Shah from Dhar and sent him to Gujrat people of Malwa made Musa Khan their leader released Sulṭān Hushang from imprisonment sent Shahzada Ahmad Khan to take possession of Malwa and to deliver it to Sulṭān Hushang Shahzada Ahmad Khan took possession of Malwa and delivered it to Sulṭān Hushang gathered a force to punish the Rajputs of Kuhnakot sent Khudawand Khan to attend on Shaiḫ Muhammad Qasim Budhu p 187 date of his illness at Naharwala Pattan placed Shahzada Ahmad Khan on his throne with the title of Naṣr ud d n Ahmad Shah ordered that the Khuṭba should be read in the prince's name date of his death period of his reign place of his tomb title after his death p 188

Zafar Khan Shahzada received the farman of Sultan Ahmad of Gujrat at Sultanpur Nadarbar defeated Shahzada Ala ud din and the Malik ut tujjar p 50 was sent by Ahmad Shah to destroy Malik ut tujjar sent Iftikhar ul mulk and Malik Suhrab Sultani to surround Thana began to conquer the district of Thana fought with the governor of Thana and made him leave Thana left a body of troops at Thana advanced on Maham p 215 defeated Malik ut tujjar and the Dakini army p 216 despatched wealthy offerings to Ahmad Shah took possession of the district of Maham and divided it among the amirs p 217

Zafar Munjumla went to release Uthman Khan p 487

Zahir ul mulk fought with Ray Mal and was slain p 301

Zahir ul mulk 宰尔 of Mahmud Khalji was slain by the army of Nizam Shah p 333

Zain Qadi criticised the decision of the Muftis p 746

Zain Badr pursued Adam Khan p 672 his death p 679

Zain Khan cut off Bahadur Gilani's head and sent it to Mahmud Shah p 125 was granted the horses and weapons of Bahadur Gilani p 126

Zain ud din Hasan Qadi pp 14 125

Zain ul abidin Sulṭān son of Sulṭān Sikandar Sulṭān of Kashmir accession extension of empire qualifications p 652 measures to stop robbery order for the benefit of public granted the prayer of Sri Bhat p 653 social religious and administrative reforms p 654 attitude towards his subjects religious freedom wealth and expenditure p 655 treatment of the learned men of Islam and Yogis example of his intelligence p 656 orders for the criminals his abstinence patronage of the men of skill and art his literary work p 657 educational ability gifts from various sovereigns p 659 his heir his sons p 660 grant to the sons of Sri Bhat p 661 his recovery by the science of Yogis p 662 defeated Haji Khan p 663 famine in Kashmir p 664 attack of Adam Khan sent for Haji Khan p 666 destruction of Adam Khan p 667 his heir p 668 arrival of Adam Khan illness rejected the suggestion of the amirs hostility among his sons his last days p 670 period of reign p 672

Zirak servants of Fath Khan released the imprisoned amirs p 687

II GEOGRAPHICAL

A

Ābū, pp 231, 233, 278
 Adanpūr, p 717
 Āgar, pp 570, 589
 Āgra, pp 378, 379, 610, 616, 617, 618, 746
 Ahār, p 532
 Ahlan, p 738
 Ahmadābād, pp 45, 79, 92, 191, 194, 195, 196, 197, 203, 206, 208, 209, 212, 217, 219, 221, 223, 224, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 239, 241, 243, 245, 247, 250, 252, 255, 256, 260, 262, 263, 264, 267, 268, 271, 290, 295, 296, 300, 307, 308, 310, 311, 312, 317, 318, 319, 330, 332, 338, 346, 369, 376, 377, 378, 380, 381, 386, 387, 388, 393, 395, 399, 400, 403, 404, 405, 407, 409, 410, 413, 522, 523, 616, 797
 Ahmadnagar, pp 135, 137, 139, 148, 153, 157, 158, 167, 209, 210, 212, 247, 300, 309, 311, 312, 316, 391
 'Ajām, p 108
 Ajmīr, pp 525, 528, 530
 Ajodahan, p 451
 Alhanpūr, pp 520, 546, 547
 Amhar, p 232
 Ancha, p 160
 Ankar, p 160
 Ankhōr, p 192
 'Arab, pp 108, 238, 659, 767, 768, 769
 Arānkāl, p 38
 Asāwal, pp 177, 183
 Āshnagar, p 641
 Āshta, pp 358, 506, 564, 616, 628
 Ashtanagar, p 302
 Āshtnagar, p 641
 Asīr, pp 57, 58, 135, 157, 158, 196, 197, 213, 214, 244, 281, 283, 284, 289, 344, 355, 367, 368, 386, 527, 533, 534, 570, 576, 580, 586, 602
 Atak, p 761
 Aūdan, p 687
 Āwās, p 338

B

Bābal, p 810
 Bachhrā, p 766
 Badakhshān, p 811
 Bādhal, p 734
 Badhūl, pp 14, 15, 32, 194
 Badnagar, p 310
 Bādūkhī, 735
 Baghdād, p 762
 Baglāna, p, 217
 Bahār Bābā Hājī, pp 581, 584, 589, 590
 Baharmal, pp 714, 715
 Bahdar, pp 408, 409, 410
 Bahmanābād, p 769
 Bahrāich, p 447
 Bahrāmgala, p 687
 Bahrāmgalah, pp 709, 710, 715, 716
 Bahārāh, pp 648, 738
 Bahrōj, pp 9, 184, 189, 190, 343, 377, 396, 398, 400, 402, 403, 406, 409, 410, 413, 472
 Bakankālū, pp 557, 558
 Bākar, pp 257, 308, 343, 347, 348, 349
 Bakīr, p 105
 Baklāna, p 527
 Bākūr, p 224
 Bālāpūr, p 534
 Balāvat, p 350
 Bālkōr, p 163
 Balūchistān, p 795
 Ban, pp 713, 723
 Banās, pp 285, 529
 Bāndhū, p 195
 Bangāla, pp 414, 415, 419, 420, 421, 423, 426, 430, 617, 618, 627
 Bangālah, pp 438, 445, 446, 463
 Bāngul, pp 694, 697
 Banharīa, p 356
 Bāmhāl, p 723
 Bānkāl, pp 721, 744
 Bānswāla, pp 313, 314, 349, 351
 Bānswālah, pp 623, 627
 Bārah, pp 275, 557, 727

Baramula pp 647 667 690 713 714
 716 734 749 750 760
 Baran p 452
 Barasinor p 521
 Bardah p 811
 Barhar pp 456 418
 Baroda pp 189 191 7 7 72
 88 90 93 294 334 335 34
 366 377 401 403 413 3 86
 Barn m p 27
 Barsal p 754
 Baslur p 163
 Batrak p 334
 Batuh pp 34 324 337 404
 Baukala p 163
 Bawar p 246
 Bedbanagar p 141
 Behar pp 44 44 448
 Behushtpur pp 7 74 83
 Behrah pp 79 793
 Bonares pp 460 5 0
 Bengal pp 617 798 811
 Berar pp 70 146 148 157 6 34
 38
 Besalnagar p 310
 Beyt pp 61 263
 Bhagnagar p 171
 Bhakkar pp 778 713 784 786 73
 80
 Bhakor p 30
 Bhandur pp 517 567
 Bhulpur p 333
 Bhilsa pp 358 359 367 133 00
 501 505 547 588 593 55 608
 609 617 6 8 6 9
 Bhulwarah p 6 3
 Bhun pp 481 48 1
 Bhumbar pp 645 664 685 607 700
 Biana p 371
 Bianah p 452
 Bidar pp 3 45 87 89 90 3 103
 117 130 13 134 164 44 79
 34 534 53
 Bihat 1 p 667 728 757
 Bihut p 683
 Bijagarh p 580

Bijanagar pp 19 20 8 30 3 34
 44 59 69 99 181 36 300 301 306
 Bijapur pp 83 88 156 157 158
 160 167
 Bilampatan p 13
 Bir pp 83 713
 Birakar p 99
 Birkinia pp 101 10
 Birpur pp 185 404
 Biyana pp 479 520 526 54 517
 Bombay p 50
 Borkal p 120
 Brahman abad pp 765 769
 Bundi p 332
 Burhanpur pp 135 157 158 196
 213 214 283 284 85 286 289
 355 360 374 377 384 385 386
 388 401 406 510 60 615

C

Ceylon p 76
 Chakdhar p 70
 Chal pur p 72
 Champanur pp 19 196 199 01
 203 204 217 22 23 257 262
 263 269 27 273 274 276 278
 281 282 85 99 301 306 308
 317 318 319 324 328 329 332
 334 336 338 341 343 346 348
 354 355 368 369 375 376 377
 378 379 385 386 396 398 521
 551 5 586 601 614 615 616
 Clanab p 801
 Chanderni pp 298 367 373 456 499
 501 503 505 506 507 516 517
 518 523 54 535 547 563 565
 567 568 571 572 583 584 588
 590 592 593 595 96
 Chaul p 8
 Chinab p 723
 Chitor pp 33 34 305 312 314
 317 321 325 330 350 351 357
 359 362 365 369 371 372 311
 312 314 315 316 527 531 370
 602 606 607 616 617 632
 Chunar p 455

D

Dābal, p 97
 Dabil, p 715
 Dabōhī, pp 257, 347
 Dābul, pp 117, 118, 121, 159, 279
 Dahūd, pp 274, 294, 297, 342, 591, 601, 615
 Dahūi, pp 187, 225
 Dāiyarah, p 737
 Dakin, pp 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 22, 52, 81, 219
 Dal, p 730
 Dāmpūr, p 728
 Danduka, p 398
 Dandūqa, pp 331, 387
 Dandwāna, pp 179, 206
 Danil, p 712
 Dār, p 711
 Dārāpūr, p 649
 Darbadū, p 718
 Dataibār, p 709
 Daulatābād, pp 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 18, 92, 213, 214, 216, 245, 293, 536, 537
 Dēbul, pp 762, 764, 765, 768
 Deccan, pp 3, 4, 53, 54, 88, 89, 90, 92, 102, 118, 135, 136, 138, 139, 144, 147, 151, 156, 157, 158, 160, 197, 214, 215, 216, 218, 219, 220, 243, 244, 245, 260, 279, 288, 345, 346, 392, 480, 527, 533, 534, 536, 538, 540, 587, 798, 811
 Dēhī, p 336
 Dehlī, pp 7, 37, 127, 173, 175, 177, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 206, 222, 277, 289, 321, 322, 326, 381, 391, 392, 415, 422, 423, 424, 444, 448, 449, 451, 452, 453, 460, 461, 462, 463, 468, 509, 542, 547, 548, 561, 592, 628, 641, 642, 643, 647, 652, 680, 681, 693, 697, 774, 787, 788, 789, 791, 793, 794, 805, 811
 Delhī, pp 127, 594, 680
 Deogah, p 17
 Deorkonda, pp 47, 77
 Dēvla, pp 297, 302, 306, 351
 Dēvsar, p 719

Dhail, p 755
 Dhāmōd, p 203
 Dhamōnī, p 595
 Dhankōt, pp 793, 795
 Dhanūra, p 285
 Dhār, pp 185, 187, 190, 298, 299, 303, 305, 306, 355, 356, 357, 469, 470, 472, 474, 525, 557, 559, 560, 566, 571, 588, 590, 602, 604, 605, 612, 615, 621
 Dhāragah, pp 2, 8, 9, 298
 Dhōl, p 313
 Dhōlpūr, p 480
 Dīb, p 215
 Dībālpūr, pp 352, 356, 467, 566, 583, 588
 Dībālpūr Banharīya, p 604
 Dilāwara, p 299
 Dilāwarah, pp 352, 590
 Dilwāra, pp 179, 220
 Dilwarah, p 532
 Dīp, pp 181, 242, 282, 317, 330, 344, 347, 369, 375, 380, 381
 Dīpālpūr Banharīa, p 205
 Dōhut, p 711
 Dūlāpūr, p 678
 Dūlqa, pp 387, 398, 404
 Dūmrah, p 731
 Dūn, pp 246, 282
 Dundāh, p 479
 Dūngarpūr, pp 220, 308, 313, 330, 331, 404, 406, 533

E

Egypt, pp 537, 659
 Ekdāla, pp 423, 426, 443, 446
 Elīchpūr, pp 157, 534, 537, 538
 Enij, pp 456, 457, 517, 518, 567

F

Fathābād, pp 518, 542
 Fathpūr, p 756
 Fīrūzābād, pp 36, 89, 90, 244, 535

G

Ganesa pp 0 4
 Ganges pp 449 451
 Garjistan p 159
 Ghati Bawah p 5
 Ghana p 641
 Ghiyaspur p 415
 Ghogha p 68
 Gilan pp 159 6 9
 Gilwara p 306
 Gita Deorah pp 231 33
 Goa pp 99 101 1 6
 Golkonda pp 106 168 169
 Gondwana pp 244 366 500 88
 59 6
 Gondwara pp 90 9 537
 Gosawar p 687
 Goswa p 106
 Gujrat pp 3 4 9 18 0 54 55
 9 107 117 118 1 7 157 173
 173 179 180 181 184 186 187
 190 19 197 199 200 201 206
 07 08 15 16 18 20 1
 2 6 7 3 237 245 251
 52 71 79 89 94 295 99
 309 306 316 321 3 9 396 328
 330 338 339 348 355 356 357
 359 365 364 367 368 369 374
 375 376 377 378 379 380 389
 384 386 387 399 393 395 397
 398 400 402 405 410 412 413
 414 449 467 469 470 475 473
 474 479 494 506 5 5 4 525
 597 586 591 601 603 604 605
 607 608 610 613 616 617 623
 631 63 750 780 781 797 798
 811
 Gulbarga pp 8 9 10 14 16 18 27
 37 38 45 46 47 50 55 97 116
 159 213 217
 Gwalhar pp 460 479 480 07 508
 6 0 6 6 4 6 7 6 9

H

Harar Ba r p 748
 Hulol pp 3 8 341

Handiyah pp 6 1 6 9 628 629
 Hanspur p 560
 Harauti pp 5 6 8 530
 Harpur p 2 0
 Harsol p 319
 Haruti p 495
 Hasanabad p 10
 Haswas p 681
 Hatiyapol p 654
 Hatmati p 09
 Hind pp 392 763
 Hindaun p 509
 Hindiah p 566
 Hindu Koh p 811
 Hindukush p 641
 Hindustan pp 13 191 3 1 4 0 519
 5 8 541 597 671 676 691 695
 694 699 700 701 708 7 6 757
 73 737 750 798 810
 Hirahpur pp 688 691 716 746 7 4
 Hirapur p 716
 Hirpur pp 664 687
 Hormuz p 660
 Hurmuz p 161
 Hushangabad pp 483 499 500 501
 5 6

I

Idar pp 177 180 181 199 194 209
 210 211 19 2 4 247 48 57
 56 300 301 306 307 308 309
 343 347 551
 Indarkot pp 714 715 716 718 719
 India pp 381 399 468 660 676 677
 681 787 788
 Indus 668
 Iraq pp 108 137 161 647 689
 Islamabad pp 367 499
 Itawah pp 447 448 449

J

Jagat pp 2 9 60 61 963
 Jainagar pp 05 08 421 4 3 47
 416 477 479
 Jak p 730
 Jakdar p 648
 Jakir p 15

Jalālpūr, p 541
 Jālandar, p 686
 Jālma, pp 62, 65, 72, 216
 Jālōr, p 270
 Jalwāra, p 179
 Jamalnagarī, pp 698, 750
 Jamjah, p 731
 Jammū, pp 650, 651, 671, 680, 682, 688, 713, 756
 Jamuna, pp 452, 461, 517
 Jar, p 178
 Jārūd, p 722
 Jātba, pp 481, 482, 483
 Jaukas, p 751
 Jaupūr, pp 186, 322, 330, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 456, 457, 460, 462, 463, 467, 481, 515, 516, 793
 Jāwār, p 609
 Jhālāwār, pp 318, 386, 472
 Jhālū, pp 711, 728
 Jharō, p 724
 Jhavār, p 756
 Jhelum, pp 667, 683, 728, 757
 Jinūr, p 203
 Jūnāgarh, pp 196, 248, 253, 254, 264, 277, 379, 398
 Jūnīr, pp 75, 94, 95, 97, 113, 137
 Jūthānah, p 400

K

Kach, pp 187, 257, 795
 Kachwārah, pp 541, 542, 569
 Kābul, p 723
 Kadrūlā, pp 629, 630
 Kahrār, pp 362, 363, 700
 Kahtwārah, p 750
 Kahunahāmū, pp 732, 733
 Kaikanā, pp 97, 98
 Kaitūr, p 631
 Kākrēj, p 399
 Kākrīa, pp 407, 408
 Kākrūn, pp 307, 367, 368, 479, 488, 605, 606
 Kākpūr, p 755
 Kālāchabūtia, p 139

Kalahmāt, p 732
 Kaland, p 214
 Kālāpūr, p 122
 Kalhar, pp 121, 122
 Kālīādah, pp 199, 474
 Kālūjar, p 623
 Kālīyādah, p 569
 Kālma, p 289
 Kālpi, pp 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 480, 481, 507, 511, 515, 516, 518, 519
 Kālūpūr, pp 404, 405
 Kambāyat, p 215
 Kampilah, p 447
 Kamrāj, pp 666, 667, 673, 706, 710, 719, 721, 722, 746, 749
 Kanauj, pp 449, 450, 451
 Kanbal, p 504
 Kanbāyat, pp 175, 177, 189, 263, 268, 343, 344, 346, 347, 351, 356
 Kanbāyet, 369, 375, 411
 Kandāu, p 105
 Kandāsah, p 575
 Kandūyah, pp 558, 587, 588, 591
 Kanjī, pp 105, 106
 Kānkrīa, p 318
 Kankūla, p 66
 Kānthā, pp 205, 406
 Kānthū, p 176
 Kāntū, p 202
 Kānūr, p 367
 Kapaibanj, pp 228, 243, 252, 318, 523
 Karbala, p 43
 Karichī, pp 349, 351
 Karī, pp 398, 400, 479
 Kāritha, p 203
 Karkhī, p 611
 Karmā, p 677
 Karmal, p 708
 Karnāl, pp 195, 196, 248, 249, 250, 253, 254, 255, 277
 Kaināi, p 272
 Karsawār, p 687
 Kāshgharī, pp 701, 703, 704, 710, 716, 723, 728

Kashmir pp 63- 635 636 637 639
 643 647 650 651 652 653 657
 658 659 661 662 663 664 665
 671 675 676 681 68 683 686
 687 688 689 690 691 692 694
 695 697 699 700 701 04 706
 707 708 713 715 717 719 720
 73 78 734 737 738 739 740
 741 74 743 746 747 749 750
 751 754 756 757 760 761 811

Kat Lal p 630

Kavri p 404

Kawah p 09

Kawil pp 94 111 113 131 13
 83 84 89 345 387 383

Kehrle pp 36 52 95 47 480 530
 38 40

Khalidgarh pp 716 721 731

Khalipur p 317

Khalipur p 8

Khanawal pp 79- 703 795

Khanpur pp 334 347 40 410 3
 716 717

Khari p 243

Khari nadi pp 393 404

Kharkun p 580

Khawah p 7 7

Khawar p 7 0

Khawaryarah p 10

Khur p 619

Khod p 735

Kholabuyah p 691

Khurasan pp 108 161 647 657 659
 796

Khusab p 79

Kilwara pp 212 0

Kilwarah 53

Kal twar pp 637 639 711 738 750

Kishun p 557

Kz p 63

Kodhra p 63

Kodhra pp 296 97

Kokan p 97

Kol pp 447 448

Kolapur pp 97 98 123

Konbhalmir pp 51 53 63

Kosur p 710

Kothar p 720

Kothra p 226

Kot Karor pp 793 795

Kotli Bira p 6 9

Krishna pp 16 19 21 30 59

Kuhnal ot p 187

Kumayun p 811

Kumbhalmir pp 231 233 34

L

Lachminagar p 642

Lahore pp 381 6 7 707 749 803
 810 811

Lakhnauti pp 420 421 422 4 6
 418 6 0

Lakial ot p 313

Lalpur 737

Lar pp 701 710 711 727 738

Larkot pp 64 643 663 681 684
 695 699

Lorgaon p 586

Lulipur p 694

Lund ot p 723

M

Machal pp 98

Madanjah p 732

Madwar p 713

Maham pp 0 214 215 216 217
 218 222

Mahesar p 471

Mahm pp 20 118

Mahundpur p 205

Mahundi pp 197 203 334 396 398
 406 522

Mahisra p 205

Mahmudabad pp 331 376 397 39
 403 404 411 527 538 540

Mahobah p 519

Maholi p 526

Mahrassa pp 192 193 197 279 96
 313 318 319 331 332 348 473
 474

Mahr pp 48 71 94 34 5 6 527

Mal pp 33 343

Valdirak p 59
 Varbada pp 197 283 336 333 379
 617

Varwar pp 507 508

Vasratabad pp 160 336 374 384

Naurozkot p 737

Vausari p 377

Naushahr pp 673 676 68 698 741
 750

Naushahrah p 713

Nawil p 671

Nilab p 668

Nilwara p 106

N r p 730

Nurun pp 765 766

O

Orissa pp 57 105 448 458 459 160
 811

P

Pahalwana p 353

Pakli pp 71 773

Pal p 396

Pallasila p 663

Panala pp 1 3 1 5 1 6

Pandua p 4 6

Panduah p 443

Panipat p 694

Panna p 509

Parantej p 311

Patlad p 411

Pattan pp 175 176 177 178 179

181 18 184 188 190 215 290

290 300 306 377 398 399 413
 470

Pattana p 735

Persia p 163

Peshavar p 641

Pir Panjal p 681

Punch pp 667 675 715

Punj p 108

Punjab pp 647 655 660 685 696
 700 793 802 803 805 810

Q

Qabq p 756

Qadipur p 379

Qandahar pp 634 637 641 778 779
 780 781

Qanauj p 182

Qutb ud dinpur pp 660 670 671

R

Radhanpur pp 398 399

Raichur p 18

Rajpur pp 48 60 61

Raisin pp 358 359 365 366 367
 373 375 376 608 615 616 617
 628 629

Rajauri pp 651 650 656 658 659
 664 608 715 713 716 734 741
 74 750 756

Rajawiyah pp 558 559

Rajkonda p 47

Rajmandri pp 104 116

Rakhial p 265

Ran p 257

Rangta p 98

Rantambhor pp 526 527 621

Ranthambhor pp 5 0 543 559 571
 583

Ranthambor p 350

Rupri p 448

Rasulabad p 337

Ratah pp 457 518 519

Rathor p 221

Ravi p 803

Rawar p 750

S

Sabarmati pp 191 1 536 338 40

Sa dulpur pp 356 357 568

Saahir p 24

Sahvunj p 334

Sajanpur p 555

Sajor p 270

Salah p 746

Salala p 1 3

Samarqand pp 560 498 647 65

Sambla p 3 1

Samnah p 724

Sanbal pp 451 611

Sangesar p 61

Saniur 1 194

Sarābah, pp 579, 580.
 Sārangpūr, pp. 206, 207, 350, 358, 372,
 478, 479, 503, 504, 505, 512, 523,
 540, 559, 567, 593, 608, 609, 615,
 616, 619, 621, 627, 628, 629, 630,
 631
 Sarkēj, p 292
 Sarkhēj, pp 242, 265, 323, 337, 412
 Sarsati, palace at, p 563
 Satwās, pp 587, 589, 591, 592, 608,
 610, 611, 622
 Sāwal, p 402
 Sēwī, pp 778, 779, 789, 803
 Shādīābād, pp 491, 501, 508, 511, 514,
 515, 519, 521, 522, 525, 526, 527,
 528, 530, 532, 533, 537, 538, 541,
 542, 557, 559, 560, 561, 566, 567,
 569, 570, 574, 575, 580, 583, 584,
 585, 589, 594, 596, 604, 605, 614
 Shahahābād, p 588
 Shāhbang, p 668
 Shāhpūr, pp 353, 454
 Shahrāī, pp 584, 594.
 Shakar, pp 27, 29
 Shērkōt, p 733
 Shihābpūr, p 642
 Shihāb-ud-dīnpūr, p 716
 Shikārpūr, p 590
 Shīrāz, pp 498, 764
 Shōlāpūr, p 159
 Shōr, pp 792, 793, 794, 796, 802, 803,
 804, 805
 Siālkōt, pp 651, 680, 713, 745, 756
 Sihwān, pp 766, 779, 780, 784
 Sīkandarpūr, pp 672, 676
 Sīlī, p 283
 Sīnd, pp 258, 259, 640, 647, 652, 763,
 764, 768, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775,
 777, 778, 780, 781, 782, 784, 786,
 787, 793, 795
 Sīpla, p 350
 Sīprī, pp 571, 572
 Sīrōhī, pp 231, 234, 257, 413
 Sīrōnj, p 593
 Sīrsīah, pp 584, 585
 Sīsams, p 767.

Sītpūr, p 795
 Sīwālīk, p 647
 Sīwistān, pp 766, 767
 Sōmnāth, pp 178, 181
 Sōnāīgāon, p 420
 Sōnkara, p 202
 Sonkhera, p 204
 Sonkhir, p 263
 Sōrath, pp 196, 199, 227, 249, 252,
 253, 277, 312, 377, 379, 386, 398,
 410, 811
 Sīnagar, pp 639, 682, 686, 687, 698,
 699, 706, 708, 709, 710, 716, 717,
 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 732,
 734, 735, 740, 741, 746, 748, 750,
 757, 760, 761
 Sūdipū, p 352
 Sultānābād, p 204
 Sultānpūr pp 50, 196, 219, 243, 245,
 280, 284, 285, 325, 329, 338, 341,
 473, 522
 Sundarsī, p 559
 Sūnkai, pp 116, 375
 Sūrat, p 525
 Sutlej, p 641
 Sūyyāpūr, pp 667, 677, 716, 721, 733,
 747, 757
 Syria, p 764

T

Tahrād, pp 398, 399
 Tālnīr, pp 198, 199, 219, 244, 402, 403
 Tambōl, pp 54, 196, 197, 218, 219
 Tāptī, pp 281, 525
 Tar, p 178
 Tārāpūr, pp 206, 478, 501
 Talwāra, pp 398, 399
 Thahnah, p 558
 Thālnū, pp 284, 286
 Thāna, pp 215, 216
 Thatha, pp 3, 10, 345, 756, 780, 784,
 795, 805, 810
 Tibet, pp 645, 652, 660, 663, 701, 710,
 712, 716, 723, 727, 738, 739, 740,
 749
 Tīlang, pp 46, 60, 79, 80, 105, 111
 Tīptī, p 217

Tirhut pp 448 459
 Tu_hlaqabad p 509

U

Uch pp 196 798
 Ucha p 789
 Uchh p 639
 Ujjain pp 205 206 304 305 306
 357 468 474 478 48 504 505
 509 566 569 582 583 588 589
 607 604 611 615 616 619 620
 6 1 6 7 6-8 6-9

Usmanpur p 405

V

Visalnagar pp 110 11
 Vitasta p 667

W

Wahl p 719
 Walipur pp 638 677
 Wantaj pp 190 19
 Wurangal p 79

Y

Ychuyypur p 635

Z

Zainagar pp 678 705
 Zaingar p 730
 Zamgarh pp 736 744
 Zumpur pp 741 744 748
 Zirbad p 104

